DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 544	PS 011 898
AUTHOR	Turner, Terry; Miles, Jackie
TITLE	An Evaluation of Early Education Classes in Queensland.
INSTITUTION	Queensland Dept. of Education, Brisbane (Australia).
PUB DATE	Jan 80
NOTE	158p.; Queensland Department of Education, Research Branch, Evaluation Series.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; Parent Participation; Pilot Projects; *Preschool Education; *Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Teacher Aides; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia (Queensland)

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of a pilot form of preschool education in Queensland, Australia. Following background information (Chapter I) about the sampling methodology used in and the administration of the study, the classroom environment and the teachers' work program are described in Chapter II. The effect of the early education classroom environment on the students is the main emphasis of Chapter III. Chapter III also reports the responses of teachers and principals to questionnaires soliciting their opinions on the success of the pilot project. Also discussed are the effects of a range of factors on the attainment of the teachers' educational aims. Areas of consensus and difference among teachers concerning the role of support services are examined in Chapter IV. Chapter V examines the part played by teacher aides and parent volunteers, and in Chapter VI the administrative difficulties faced by principals of the pilot schools are discussed. Finally, Chapter VII brings the results of the previous chapters together and attempts to form a coherent evaluation of the pilot project. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196544

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF EARLY EDUCATION CLASSES IN QUEENSLAND

Terry Turner
Jackie Miles

Research Branch
Department of Education, Queensland

January 1980

PS 011898

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. W. Cassin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Cherie Duke and Greg Duck, Research Branch, for their assistance in the early stages of the Early Education Class Project. Our thanks go also to the teachers and principals who gave their time to complete the lengthy questionnaires and interviews.

National Library of Australia
Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Turner, Terry.
Early education class report.

(Evaluation series)
ISBN 0 7242 0706 6

1. Education, Preschool – Queensland. I. Miles, Jackie, joint author. II. Title. (Series: Queensland. Dept. of Education. Research Branch. Evaluation series).

372'.21'09943

CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

INTRODUCTION 1

- Background 1
- Sampling and Administration of the Study 1
- Structure of the Report 3

WORK PROGRAM 5

- Responses Specific to the Early Education Class 5
- Areas of Difference Among Teacher Types 7
- Responses of Teachers in General 7
- Teacher Planning 8
- Teaching Style 9
- Role of Other Personnel 11
- Summary 12

EDUCATIONAL AIMS 29

- Importance and Success Ratings 29
- Importance of Educational Aims 29
- Teachers in 1977 29
  - Areas of consensus among respondents 29
- Teachers in 1978 31
  - Areas of consensus among respondents 31
  - Areas of difference among respondents 32
- Success in Achieving Educational Aims 33
  - Areas of consensus among respondents 33
  - Areas of difference among respondents 35
- Conditions Hindering Attainment of Educational Aims 37
  - Areas of consensus among respondents 37
  - Areas of difference among respondents 39
- Opinions on the Early Education Class Project 40
- Summary 41

SUPPORT SERVICES 74

- Types of Support Services 74
  - General support services 74
  - Restricted support services 76
- Areas of Support Provided by Support Services 77
  - Areas of consensus among teachers 77
  - Areas of difference among teachers 78
- Summary 79

TEACHER AIDES AND PARENT VOLUNTEERS 89

- Teacher Aides 89
- Parent Volunteers 91
- Summary 92

Page

ADMINISTRATION OF EARLY EDUCATION CLASS SCHOOLS 99

Administrative Difficulties with the Early Education Class 99
The Principal's Involvement with the Early Education Class 101
Summary 102

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 105

APPENDIX 1: SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS 111

APPENDIX 2: IMPORTANCE AND SUCCESS RATINGS OF EDUCATIONAL AIMS 131

REFERENCES 151

5

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1.1 Return Rates of Questionnaires 4

Table 2.1 Integration of Pre-school and Lower Primary Years in Early Education Classes 15

Table 2.2 Statements on the Work Program, Pre-school: Those Answered Only by EEC Teachers 17

Table 2.3 Statements About the Work Program: Responses Significantly Different Between EEC Schools and Pre-schools 18

Table 2.4 Statements About the Work Program: Responses Significantly Different Between EEC and PR Schools 19

Table 2.5 Statements on the Work Program, Pre-school 21

Table 2.6 Statements on the Work Program, Year 1 23

Table 2.7 Statements on the Work Program, Year 2 27

Table 3.1 Educational Aims 43

Table 3.2 Aims Rated Most and Least Important by 1977 Teachers 45

Table 3.3 Aims Rated Most and Least Important by Principals 47

Table 3.4 Aims Rated Most and Least Important by 1978 Teachers 49

Table 3.5 Aims for which Importance was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Teachers 50

Table 3.6 Aims for which Importance was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Principals 53

Table 3.7 Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by 1977 Teachers 54

Table 3.8 Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by Principals 57

Table 3.9 Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by 1978 Teachers 60

Table 3.10 Aims for which Success was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Teachers 62

Table 3.11 Aims for which Success was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Principals 67

Table 3.12 Factors Hindering Attainment of Educational Aims 69

Table 3.13 Factors Hindering Attainment of Educational Aims and that Differ Among Teacher Types 71

Table 3.14 Opinions of the EEC Scheme from Teachers and Principals in Schools with an Early Education Class 72

Table 4.1 Support Services Provided to All Types of Schools in the Survey 81

Table 4.2 Support Services Provided to All School Types: Responses Significantly Different Among School Types 82

Table 4.3 Support Services Provided to EEC and PR Schools Only 83

Table 4.4 Support Services Provided to EEC and PR Schools Only 84

Table 4.5 Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for All Types of Schools in the Survey 85

Table 4.6 Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for Various Types of Schools 86

Table 4.7 Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for All School Types: Responses Significantly Different Among School Types 87

Table 5.1 Aide Involvement in the Teaching Program 93

Table 5.2 Activities of the Aide 94

Table 5.3 Proportion of Early Education Class Aide's Time Spent with the Class 94

Page

Table 5.4 Presence of Parent Volunteers in the Classroom 95
Table 5.5 Numbers of Parent Volunteers 95
Table 5.6 Organisation of Parent Volunteers 96
Table 5.7 Parent Participation in Various Areas 97
Table 5.8 Activities of Parent Volunteers 98
Table 6.1 Administrative Difficulties with Early Education Class Schools 103
Table 6.2 Principal's Involvement with the Early Education Class 104

Appendix 1

Table A1.1 Number of Children Enrolled in Each Year Level 118
Table A1.2 Number of Children Enrolled in the Lowest Class in the School 119
Table A1.3 Number of Children Enrolled in the Class Above the Lowest Class in the School 119
Table A1.4 Attendance Pattern of Pre-School Children 120
Table A1.5 Age Distribution of 1977 Teachers 121
Table A1.6 Pre-Service Qualifications of 1977 Teachers 121
Table A1.7 Additional Qualifications of 1977 Teachers 122
Table A1.8 Teaching Experience of 1977 Teachers 123
Table A1.9 Attendance at In-Service Courses on Early Childhood Education by 1977 Teachers 124
Table A1.10 Duration of Attendance at In-Service Courses on Early Childhood Education by 1977 Teachers 124
Table A1.11 Age Distribution of Aides 125
Table A1.12 Qualifications of Aides 125
Table A1.13 Time for Which Aide is Employed 126
Table A1.14 Age Distribution of Principals 126
Table A1.15 Educational Qualifications of Principals Beyond Pre-Service Training 126
Table A1.16 Teaching Experience of Principals 127
Table A1.17 Age Distribution of 1978 Teachers 127
Table A1.18 Pre-Service Qualifications of 1978 Teachers 127
Table A1.19 Additional Qualifications of 1978 Teachers 128
Table A1.20 Teaching Experience of 1978 Teachers 129

Appendix 2

Table A2.1 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Social and Emotional Aims 131
Table A2.2 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: General Cognitive Aims 132
Table A2.3 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Physical Aims 133
Table A2.4 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Language Aims 134
Table A2.5 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Mathematics Aims 135
Table A2.6 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Social Studies Aims 136
Table A2.7 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Art Aims 137

Page

Table A2.8 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Music Aims 138
Table A2.9 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Science Aims 139
Table A2.10 Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Community Aims 140
Table A2.11 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Social and Emotional Aims 141
Table A2.12 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals, General Cognitive Aims 142
Table A2.13 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Physical Aims 143
Table A2.14 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Language Aims 144
Table A2.15 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Mathematics Aims 145
Table A2.16 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Social Studies Aims 146
Table A2.17 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Art Aims 147
Table A2.18 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Music Aims 148
Table A2.19 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Science Aims 149
Table A2.20 Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Community Aims 140

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In May 1972, the Queensland Government decided to introduce pre-school education and to make it available to all children aged 4 to 5 years. Because the population of Queensland is so widely scattered, it was not feasible to attach a pre-school centre to each State primary school. It was therefore decided to provide three separate forms of pre-school education.

The first form of pre-school education occurs in areas where the primary school is large, with an enrolment in excess of 100 pupils. Such schools are typically located in metropolitan areas or in larger towns. A pre-school centre is located either in the grounds of the primary school or nearby. The centre may be composed of from one to three units, each headed by a teacher with responsibility for up to 50 children who attend part-time in two sessions.

The second form of pre-school education caters for those children in remote areas who will later enrol in the Primary Correspondence School, or who will attend a primary school with an enrolment of less than 36 pupils. A pre-school correspondence program is provided for these children.

The third form of pre-school education is designed to fill the gap between the first two forms. That is, it is intended to offer pre-school education to those children who will later enrol in schools of from 36 to 100 pupils (Class 4 schools). This is done by enrolling pre-school aged children in the Class 4 primary school and forming an early education class. The class is composed of the pre-schoolers plus children from the lower primary school years, typically Year 1 and sometimes Year 2.

While the first two forms of pre-school education have been in operation for several years, the third form is in the pilot stage. In 1976, a total of 19 Class 4 primary schools participated in the pilot project by enrolling pre-school children. In 1977, the number of schools involved had increased to fifty-six. This report is an evaluation of the pilot project as it existed in 1977.

The pilot project is an important one because it provides an opportunity for the integration of pre-school and primary school approaches to education. Educational practices in pre-schools and lower primary school classrooms are often quite different. One major difference between the two approaches is that in primary schools there is typically a common program through which all children progress. In contrast, there tend to be individual programs for each child in pre-school although, naturally, common interests and abilities among the children lead to the development of common program strands for groups of the pre-schoolers. Another major difference is that primary school education is organised around subject areas, while in the pre-school the content is drawn from subject areas rather than being organised around them. Pre-schools tend to be organised around interest centres, such as water, blocks, sand and the like. In primary schools there tends to be a high degree of structure and control imposed by the teacher, while in pre-schools there is usually more opportunity for the children to choose from activities selected by the teacher. The pre-school also stresses the development of learning skills and attitudes among the students, while the primary school stresses mastery of content.

SAMPLING AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDY

In 1977, a total of 56 Class 4 primary schools had pre-school children enrolled. Three of the 56 schools had a sufficient number of pre-schoolers to form a separate pre-school class. In the other 53, pre-school children were integrated with the lowest class at the school. These 53 are the schools of interest in this evaluation. The 56 schools surveyed were non-randomly selected from a larger set of Class 4 schools which volunteered to participate in the early education class project. Selection was largely based on whether the physical resources of the school were adequate to cope with the expected influx of pre-school children.

For the evaluation of the Early Education Class Project, it was decided to select two control groups of schools in addition to the 56 Early Education Class (EEC) schools in the project. The two control groups were pre-schools (PS) and Class 4 primary (PR) schools without an early education class. In this way it was hoped to compare the pre-schoolers in traditional pre-schools with those in early education classes, and also to compare primary school children in regular primary schools with those in primary schools with an early education class.

The control groups of pre-schools (PS) and regular Class 4 primary (PR) schools were selected on the basis of geographical location: the pre-school and the regular Class 4 primary school closest to each of the 56 experimental Class 4 schools were selected into the sample. Questionnaires were sent out in late 1977 to a randomly selected teacher at each of the pre-schools, to the teacher of the lowest class in the regular Class 4 schools, and to the teacher of the early education class in the experimental Class 4 schools. In addition, a questionnaire was sent to the principal of each Class 4 primary school in the sample.

In early 1978, a further questionnaire was sent to those teachers in the sample of Class 4 schools who were teaching the class above the lowest class in the school. These teachers would receive the children who graduated from the early education class and also serve as a control group of teachers in the regular Class 4 schools.

The return rates of the questionnaires are given in Table 1.1 (p. 4). It can be seen that the return rate for questionnaires sent in 1977 to teachers and principals in EEC schools was good (over 82 per cent). For questionnaires sent to PS teachers, to 1978 teachers in EEC schools, and to PR teachers and principals in 1977, the return rate was satisfactory (from 64 to 71 per cent). However, the return rate for questionnaires sent to PR teachers in control schools in 1978 was poor (44 per cent).

The questionnaires sought a wide variety of information on the school and on the professional and personal background of the teachers and principals. Only a summary of these results will be given here. The detailed information can be found in Appendix 1.

Information about the enrolments, staffing and class organisation in all schools indicated some differences between EEC and PR schools in the pattern of class organisation, though not in the number of pupils or staff at the schools. The tendency was for the lowest class at the school to contain a smaller number of year levels in EEC than in PR schools, typically pre-school and Year 1 as opposed to Years 1, 2 and 3. PR schools also exhibited a greater variety of patterns of allocating year levels to classes than did EEC schools. Attendance patterns for the pre-schoolers also differed between EEC schools and pre-schools: the most common pattern in EEC schools was for the pre-schoolers to attend all day for two or three days per week, whereas in traditional pre-schools it was more common for them to attend for five half-days.

Among the 1977 teachers, there were two major differences in background. EEC and PS teachers were generally considerably younger than were PR teachers and had much less teaching experience. Therefore, any other differences between EEC or PS teachers and PR teachers may perhaps be a consequence of these two background differences. Virtually all PR teachers received their training in primary teaching, while about half of the PS teachers were pre-school trained only, with the other half being both primary and pre-school trained. The majority (59 per cent) of EEC teachers had taken a combined course, but one-quarter were primary trained only, and 17 per cent pre-school trained only. There were no differences in sex composition among the 1977 teacher types: 95 per cent were female in all groups.

There were no significant differences between the principals of EEC and PR schools. All but one were male; all but one were trained in primary teaching only (one had done a combined primary/pre-school course); and none had any teaching experience with pre-school or early education classes.

The 1978 teachers in PR and EEC schools showed differences in sex composition, age, and teaching experience, though not in training. Virtually all the 1978 teachers were trained only in primary teaching. The 1978 teachers at PR schools had twice the total teaching experience of teachers in EEC schools and tended to be somewhat older. The 1978 teachers were older and had more teaching experience than the 1977 teachers. In EEC schools, 72 per cent of the 1978 teachers were female, but in PR schools 35 per cent were female. In addition, there were many more males in the 1978 sample than in the 1977 sample, indicating that older classes are more often assigned to male teachers.

STRUCTURE OF REPORT

In the chapters that follow, the working of the Early Education Class Project will be examined. Chapter 2 describes in detail the classroom environment and the teachers' work program. Chapter 3 looks at how successful the pilot project is in the eyes of those associated with it. The effect of the early education class environment on the students is the main emphasis of this chapter. Chapter 3 also discusses the effects of a range of factors on the attainment of the teachers' educational aims. Chapter 4 examines the role of a support services provided for the teacher. Chapter 5 looks at the part played by teacher aides and parent volunteers, and in Chapter 6 the administrative difficulties faced by principals of the pilot schools are discussed. Finally, Chapter 7 brings the results of the previous chapters together and attempts to form a coherent evaluation of the pilot project. Appendixes 1 and 2 provide further specific information.

Table 1.1: Return Rates of Questionnaires

Respondent	School type					
	Pre-school		Early Education Class		Primary	
	No. sent	No. returned	No. sent	No. returned	No. sent	No. returned
Teacher in 1977	56	36	56	46	52	36
Teacher in 1978	–	–	56	40	52	23
Principal in 1977	–	–	56	47	52	37

THE WORK PROGRAM

The first aim of the study was to determine exactly how the classroom experience for children in early education classes compared with that for children in regular PR or PS environments. To this end, teachers answering the 1977 questionnaire were given a number of statements about their work program. They were asked to rate the degree to which each of these statements was true for each year level they were teaching at that time. Examples of such statements are:

- *The activities are selected on the basis of student interest*
- *The program is activity based*
- *There is a set of explicit objectives for each child*
- *There is a set domain of content over which the child should gain mastery during the year.*

Some of the statements were appropriate to only some of the school types. For example, for the pre-school children, the statement, *I spend less time working with children at this year level than with those at other levels,* is appropriate only for EEC teachers, since they are the only teachers who have pre-schoolers integrated with other Years. Those statements appropriate only to EEC teachers all relate to the pre-school children only, and are given in Table 2.2 (p. 17). Statements appropriate to both EEC and PS teachers for pre-school children are given in Table 2.5 (p. 21). Statements for Year 1 and Year 2, which are appropriate only to EEC and PR teachers, are given in Tables 2.6 (p. 23) and 2.7 (p. 26). Responses are not given for Year 3 as the number of early education classes with this Year was too small for the figures to be meaningful.

RESPONSES SPECIFIC TO EARLY EDUCATION CLASSES

Since the main feature of early education classes is the joint presence of pre-school and primary school children, the first question that arises is whether the pre-school children were a separate entity within the class, or were integrated with the primary school children. Teachers of EEC classes were thus given a list of 43 educational aims (discussed fully in Chapter 3) and asked to indicate for each aim whether or not the pre-schoolers were integrated with the lower primary class in activities intended to achieve that aim. Their responses are shown in Table 2.1 (p. 14). It might be expected that the areas for which the pre-schoolers are most often integrated with primary school children would be those in which the component skills are not rigidly hierarchical in acquisition, and in which the range of skill in the class is not very wide. This expectation was largely confirmed in that the proportion of teachers who stated that they integrated was highest in the areas of social and emotional, art, music and social studies aims. Over 90 per cent of teachers stated that they integrated pre-school children with the primary children for all social and emotional aims except for the exercise of personal responsibility through choice and independence, for which only 71 per cent claimed integration. This is hardly surprising in view of the lower age of the pre-school children; one might expect that fewer teachers would accord them the same degree of personal responsibility they give to the lower primary children.

The pre-schoolers were integrated by 80 per cent or more of teachers in activities aimed at attaining all art, music and science aims. General cognitive, physical, social studies and community aims were all integrated by more than 70 per cent of teachers. Among the physical aims, all but fine muscle control (77 per cent) were integrated by 89 per cent or more of teachers. One would expect this lower level of integration for fine muscle control since activities aimed at achieving fine muscle control would be part of writing and pre-writing activities, for which only 43 per cent of teachers integrated their pre-school and primary children. Similarly, only 46 per cent integrated for reading and pre-reading activities and only 18 per cent for spelling. In the mathematics area, about half the teachers claimed to integrate for activities aims at achieving knowledge of sets and logic, and for measurement and estimation, but only 12 per cent reported integrating for number and number operations.

Thus, the only activities for which a large proportion of teachers did not integrate the pre-schoolers with the lower primary Years are those that deal with the academic areas of reading, writing and mathematics. Within these areas it was only in spelling, and in number and number operations, that appreciably less than half of the teachers reported integration. It appears then, that teachers of the early education class did not deal with the pre-school children in isolation but treated them as just another level in a multi-year class, and integrated their activities with those of the other Years wherever feasible.

Table 2.2 presents the responses of EEC teachers to those statments concerning their work program which are applicable only to them. Eighty-eight per cent of EEC teachers said it was always or generally true of the pre-schoolers that they take part in activities suited to their ability and interest regardless of year level. However only about 50 per cent of teachers (combined EEC and PR responses) said this of Years 1 and 2. It appears then that the pre-schoolers are being integrated with the higher Years in their activities quite often, but that the primary children are more confined to their own year levels. This agrees well with the response to the statement that the activities of children are shared with children at other year levels. A total of 64 per cent of EEC teachers said this was always or generally true of pre-schoolers, but only 44 per cent said it was true for Year 1 students. These differences seem to imply that while the pre-school children often share the primary school children's activities, the reverse is less often true. The attendance pattern of the pre-schoolers would account for at least part of these differences. Since pre-schoolers attend only for two-and-a-half days per week, primary school children cannot typically mix with pre-schoolers for more than half of the primary school day, while pre-schoolers could mix with primary school children for all of a typical pre-school day. Given these differences in attendance patterns, it seems that when pre-schoolers are present, the class is integrated for most activities, but that the more advanced forms of class work such as reading or mathematics are covered while the pre-schoolers are not in attendance.

Slightly more than one-quarter of EEC teachers said it was always or generally true that they spent less time working with pre-schoolers than with children from other Years in their class. This figure is not unexpected since the pre-schoolers typically attend school only two-and-a-half days a week. Slightly more than half the teachers said it was always or generally true that the parent volunteers spend most of their time with the pre-school children, but one-third said this was never true. If one compares this with the combined EEC and PR figures for the same statement, applied to Year 1 and 2 children (Tables 2.6 and 2.7), one finds that only 10 per cent of teachers said this was generally or always true for Year 1 and only three per cent for Year 2. It is apparent that parent volunteers in early education classes tend to assist more with the pre-school children than with those in other Years. It is tempting to explain this by saying that most of the parent volunteers are parents of pre-school children and are spending most of their time with their own child. However, that only 16 per cent of EEC teachers said it was generally or always true that parents spent much of their time with their own children (Table 2.3 p. 18)does not support this explanation. Perhaps the explanation is simply that the teachers believe the activity-based nature of pre-school education tends itself, once the activity has been set in motion, towards supervision by relatively untrained adults. The primary school approach, because it is more didactic, calls more for the presence of a trained adult. This hypothesis is buttressed by the fact that the teacher aide tends to spend proportionately less time with the pre-schoolers than does the parent volunteer. Only 28 per cent of teachers said it was always or generally true that the aide supervises most of the activity of the pre-schoolers, compared with 51 per cent who said that the parent volunteers spend most of their time with this group. Thus, the less training the person has, the more likely she is to concentrate on the lower year levels in the class.

Almost 70 per cent of EEC teachers felt it was always or generally true that the objectives set for the pre-school level are well integrated into the general objectives for the school. Only 10 per cent felt this was not true. These figures give support to the notion that the early education class operates as a cohesive whole and that the pre-school group is not a separate and distinct entity within the school. Although they are well integrated, the objectives for the pre-schoolers are not as well integrated into the general objectives of the school as are the objectives for Years 1 and 2; some 85 per cent of Years 1 and 2 teachers felt that their class objectives were generally or always integrated into those of the school, compared with 70 per cent for pre-school. This difference is small, given the different natures of pre-school and primary education. If any greater integration of pre-school and primary school objectives were desirable, perhaps the principal could play a more significant part in this endeavour, since the force moving the pre-schoolers into integration with the rest of the school does not seem to be the principal; only 29 per cent of teachers said that they generally or always discussed the work program with the principal. Some lower level co-ordination is effected by the principal, though, since 53 per cent of teachers said that they always or generally discussed the utilisation of resources with the principal. Nearly one-quarter said they never discuss the work program, but only 7 per cent said that they never discuss utilisation of resources.

AREAS OF DIFFERENCE AMONG TEACHER TYPES

Responses to the work program statements were significantly different among teacher types in only a few instances. In only one case were responses different between EEC and PS teachers. This case is shown in Table 2.3. EEC and PS teachers gave significantly different responses to the statement, *The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children*. EEC teachers indicated that this was less often true than did PS teachers: 42 per cent of EEC teachers said it was never true, compared with only 8 per cent of PS teachers.

Cases in which the responses of EEC and PR teachers were significantly different with regard to work program statements are given in Table 2.4 (p.19). To the statement, *The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next*, the teachers' responses were different for both Year 1 and Year 2. For both years, children in PR classes were less likely to have a large say in deciding what activity to do next than were those in early education classes. For Year 2 no PR teacher said that the children generally or always had a large say and 28 per cent said it was never so. Forty per cent of EEC teachers said the children generally or always had a large say and only 13 per cent that it was never so. A similar pattern occurred at the Year 1 level.

The statement, *The children are free to move from one learning area to another*, drew different responses from the two teacher types only for Year 1. No EEC teacher said that the children were never free to move from one area to another but 23 per cent of PR teachers did.

Teachers responded differently to the statement, *The activities of children at this year level are often shared with children at other year levels* only for Year 2. Three-quarters of EEC teachers said sharing of activities generally or always took place across year levels, but only 34 per cent of PR teachers agreed.

If one accepts the definitions of open or progressive education that appear in Walberg & Thomas (1971) or Bennett (1976), it seems that the classrooms of EEC teachers tend to have some features that are more progressive than those found in PR classrooms: their pupils are freer to move about the room and to choose their own activities, and the activities of the different year levels in the class are integrated more often. However, it cannot be stated that progressiveness is generally true of early education classes since differences were not significant for both primary school years for two of the three statements. In addition, a large number of other work program statements could be regarded as indicators of a progressive teaching style, yet teachers did not give significantly different responses to these statements.

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS IN GENERAL

Table 2.5 shows those of the work program statements which were answered by both EEC and PS teachers, and are applicable to the pre-school children. Tables 2.6 and 2.7 present the work program statements answered by EEC and PR teachers for Year 1 and Year 2 respectively. The statements in these three tables can be grouped into three categories: those dealing with the degree of planning by the teacher (statements 1–9), those dealing with the teaching style of the teacher (statements 10–26), and those dealing with the role of other personnel such as the principal, aide and parent volunteers (statements 27-31).

No tests of statistical significance have been made on the differences in teachers' responses for pre-school, Year 1 and Year 2. However, it appears from a scrutiny of Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 that teacher responses to each statement are very similar for Years 1 and 2, but in some cases different for pre-school. Where there are no apparent differences in the distribution of teacher responses between Years, only the responses for Year 1 will be discussed.

TEACHER PLANNING

Taking first the statements concerned with the degree of planning by the teacher, the distribution of responses for the first four statements is highly similar for all three levels – pre-school, Year 1 and Year 2:

1. *The program has an explicit set of general objectives.*
2. *Specific objectives are set for each lesson or activity.*
3. *The specific objectives are related explicitly to the general objectives of the program.*
4. *The work program for the week is planned in advance.*

The great majority of teachers said that these statements were always or generally true (92, 82, 92 and 80 per cent respectively for Year 1) and virtually no teacher stated that they were never true. This response is hardly surprising since teachers are required to make written plans of their educational programs. It would appear that the EEC teachers are planning just as much for the pre-school children in their class as for the other Years. It would also appear, since there were no significant differences in response between EEC and PS teachers for the pre-school children, that pre-school teachers are producing a program with specific objectives for their classes. However, when asked to estimate the amount of time spent each week in programming and planning, PS teachers gave a significantly different response from that of EEC and PR teachers. PS teachers reported spending an average of 3.9 hours per week on this activity, while EEC and PR teachers reported 7.7 and 8.3 hours respectively ($F = 9.3$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). Thus it appears that although PS teachers felt they were planning for their classes to the same extent as primary teachers, they actually spend only half as much time in programming and planning. Part of this difference may be due to the greater role of materials preparation in planning activities in pre-school. The pre-school teachers may not have incorporated this component in their estimation of time spent in programming and planning. Another explanation is that the planning reflects the pre-school emphasis on child choice of activities rather than teacher predetermination. One might have expected this, since child choice of activities rather than teacher predetermination is stressed in pre-school. Thus, it seems that while the teachers planned to the same extent, in terms of detailing program objectives, the area of planning that involves preparation of specific content for activities is used less by pre-school teachers.

Three of the statements about planning were rated less often true for pre-school children than for Years 1 and 2.

5. *The program is structured so that there is systematic progression from this year level to the next.*
   For Year 1, 57 per cent of teachers said this was always true, but only 28 per cent of teachers claimed this for pre-school.
6. *The work program is highly structured for most of the children.*
   This was rated always or generally true for Year 1 by 78 per cent of teachers, but by only 34 per cent for pre-school.

7. *The objectives set for this year level are well integrated into the objectives for the school.*

This was rated always true for Year 1 by 32 per cent of teachers, but by only 14 per cent for pre-school children taught by EEC teachers.

Two of the statements about planning were rated more often true for the pre-school level than for Years 1 and 2.

8. *There is a set of explicit objectives for each child.*

Sixty-nine per cent of teachers stated that this was always or generally true of the pre-schoolers, but only 42 per cent said this was so for Year 1.

9. *There is a minimal amount of fixed scheduling of activities.*

Sixty-nine per cent of teachers stated that this was always or generally true of the pre-school level, compared with only 35 per cent for the Year 1 level.

It was shown above that the teachers exhibit no less planned behaviour, in terms of class objectives, for the pre-schoolers than for the primary school children. However, statement 8 reveals that the teachers of pre-school children plan formally more for the individual child than do teachers of primary school children. This finding partly explains the lower integration of pre-school objectives into those of the schools as a whole. Since the pre-school teacher tends to plan for individual children rather than, as is more often the case in primary school, for the class as a whole, it is naturally more difficult to integrate class objectives for the pre-schoolers into the school objectives.

While the two types of teachers plan their programs, the execution of the teaching program is less rigid for the pre-schoolers than for primary school children. More teachers claim to avoid fixed scheduling of activities for the pre-schoolers than for Years 1 and 2, and the work program was less highly structured for the pre-schoolers. Another clear cut finding is that teachers perceive more of a gap between pre-school and the lower primary years than between Years in the lower primary school. Two results support this contention. Firstly, fewer teachers believed there was systematic progression from pre-school to the next Year than felt there was systematic progression from Years 1 to 2 and 2 to 3. Secondly, the pre-school objectives were less well integrated into those of the school as a whole than were the Year 1 and Year 2 objectives.

TEACHING STYLE

The bulk of the work program statements concerned the teaching style of the teacher. For almost all of these statements there was a difference between teacher responses for the pre-school and lower primary level. It would seem then that teachers adopt different teaching styles for dealing with pre-school and primary children.

For three statements there were no apparent differences in response for the three year levels:

20. *Peer tutoring (children teaching other children) occurs.*

This was rated always or generally true by 38 per cent of teachers for Year 1, 34 per cent for Year 2 and 47 per cent for pre-school. It appears that peer tutoring is quite common at the pre-school and lower primary level.

21. *I monitor the progress of each child.*

About 87 per cent of teachers said this was always or generally true for all three year levels.

23. *Provision is made for special activities for children with particular difficulties or problems.*

Between 80 and 90 per cent of teachers rated this always or generally true for all year levels.

One statement was rated less often true for the pre-school level than the lower primary:

25. *There is a set domain of content over which the child should gain mastery during the year.*

This was rated always or generally true by about 90 per cent of teachers for Years 1 and 2 but by only 63 per cent for pre-school.

The remaining statements in the teaching style category were rated more often true for pre-school than for the lower primary children. These statements are given below, with the percentage of teachers who rated them always or generally true for each year level:

10. *The activities are selected on the basis of pupil interest.*

    (Pre-school: 86 per cent; Year 1: 60 per cent; Year 2: 55 per cent)

11. *The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next.*

    (Pre-school: 84 per cent: Years 1 and 2 responses are significantly different between EEC and PR teachers; Year 1: 30 per cent (EEC) and 6 per cent (PR); Year 2: 40 per cent (EEC) and 0 per cent (PR)

12. *The children take part in activities suited to their ability and interest regardless of year level.*

    (Pre-school: 88 per cent; Year 1: 51 per cent; Year 2: 51 per cent)

13. *The activities of children at this year level are shared with children at other year levels.*

    (Pre-school: 64 per cent; Year 1: 44 per cent. Responses are significantly different between EEC and PR teachers for Year 2: 75 per cent (EEC) and 34 per cent (PR)

14. *The program for this year level is activity based.*

    (Pre-school: 94 per cent; Year 1: 55 per cent; Year 2: 44 per cent)

16. *The learning environment is rich and varied.*

    (Pre-school: 98 per cent; Year 1: 82 per cent; Year 2: 73 per cent)

17. *The children are free to move from one learning area to another.*

    (Pre-school: 94 per cent; Year 1: responses significantly different between EEC (35 per cent) and PR (27 per cent) teachers; Year 2: 28 per cent)

18. *I try to be a resource person rather than an authority for the children.*

    (Pre-school: 90 per cent; Year 1: 54 per cent; Year 2: 51 per cent)

19. *I place more stress on how the child masters the processes of learning than on what the child knows.*

    (Pre-school: 90 per cent; Year 1: 73 per cent; Year 2: 70 per cent)

24. *The program is individualised for each child.*

    (Pre-school: 70 per cent; Year 1: 40 per cent; Year 2: 39 per cent)

In summary, the teachers reported that, compared to primary school children, their approach to the pre-schoolers is more child-centered and more individualised; involves more child choice of activities and more freedom of movement for the children; is more activity based, less routinised and more flexible; and involves more integration of subject matter, less orientation to the acquisition of specific knowledge, and more attention to the processes of acquiring knowledge. Although these characteristics by no means cover the full range of teacher behaviour that may be called progressive (see for example, Walberg & Thomas, 1971; Bennett, 1976) they clearly reflect a portion of the progressive teaching style. Thus, in terms of classroom organisation and instructional strategies, the pre-school children are treated in a more progressive manner than are the primary school children. These results are as expected. The pre-school approach to education has long been a holistic one, in which the individual child is the centre of the learning process and in which the growth and development of the whole child is the final aim. The primary school approach has, on the other hand, traditionally been one in which the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills is the prime aim, in which the main technique involves the compartmentalisation of subject matter, and in which the teacher plays a didactic rather than a consultative role. The results here show that the differences between the pre-school and the primary school approaches to education are still great. However, the early education classroom is, albeit to a fairly minor extent, an amalgamation of the two approaches, since the EEC teachers reported a style of teaching that falls somewhere between the pre-school and primary school approaches.

ROLE OF OTHER PERSONNEL

A smaller group of statements deal with the role of the principal, the teacher aide and parent volunteers. The first of these is:

27. *I discuss the work program with the principal.*

This was answered only by EEC teachers for the pre-school level since teachers in conventional pre-schools are not responsible to a principal. Only 29 per cent of EEC teachers said this was always or generally true for the pre-school level, compared with 53 per cent of EEC and PR teachers for Year 1 and 62 per cent for Year 2. This difference is not surprising in view of the lack of pre-school training and experience among the principals of schools with early education classes (See Table A1.16 in Appendix 1).

28. *I discuss utilisation of human and physical resources with the principal.*

Again, this was answered only by EEC teachers for the pre-school level. It was rated always or generally true by 63 per cent of teachers for the pre-school and Year 2 level, and by 58 per cent for Year 1. It seems then that the EEC teacher does not discuss utilisation of resources for the pre-schoolers any less than for other Years in her class.

29. *The teacher aide supervises most of the activity at this year level.*

This was also answered only by EEC teachers for the pre-school level. It was rated always or generally true by 28 per cent of the EEC teachers for the pre-schoolers, but by only 5 per cent and 12 per cent for Years 1 and 2. Thus, for more than one-quarter of the early education classes, the teacher had only minor direct interaction with the pre-school children. Since there were no significant differences among school types on this variable, it is not likely that the year differences were due to variations in the number of hours the aide is in attendance. It seems rather that when the aide concentrates on one year level it tends to be the pre-school year level because the teachers believe that the activity-based nature of pre-school education requires the presence of an adult, but not necessarily a highly trained adult, to supervise the activity once it has begun.

30. *The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children.*

This statement was rated significantly differently for the pre-school level by EEC and PS teachers: for pre-schoolers, 42 per cent of EEC teachers said it was never true compared with only 8 per cent of PS teachers. It was never true for 74 per cent at Year 1 and 88 per cent at Year 2 levels. It appears that EEC and PR schools are much more likely to use parent volunteers as though they were teacher aides than are pre-schools. Perhaps the mixing of pre-schoolers with older children in early education classes tends to reduce the need and opportunity for 'mothering' in the classroom.

31. *The parent volunteers spend most of their time with children at this year level.*

This was answered only by EEC teachers for the pre-school level. Fifty-one per cent of EEC teachers rated this statement always or generally true, while only 10 per cent and 3 per cent of teachers for Years 1 and 2 respectively did so. Thus the parent volunteer tends to concentrate on the pre-schoolers in much the way that teacher aides do, but to a greater degree, presumably because the pre-school ideology stresses parent participation and because the parents are untutored in teaching but are competent in monitoring the activity of the younger children.

Finally, there are two work program statements which relate to the integration of year levels within the class. The first of these was answered only by EEC and PR teachers since pre-school teachers do not have multi-year classes.

26. *I spend less time working with children at this year level than those at other levels.*

Seventy per cent of teachers said this was never true of Year 1 and 60 per cent of Year 2, but only 34 per cent felt it was never true of the pre-school level. The combination of responses to this statement with those to the statements that *the teacher aide supervises most of the activity at this year level* and that *the parent volunteers spend most of their time with children at this year level,* confirmed that EEC teachers tend to concentrate on the older children while the parent volunteers and teacher aides concentrate on the younger children.

22. *The program adequately caters for children at this year level.*

Nearly all teachers rated this statement as always or generally true for all three year levels: 94 per cent for pre-school, 97 per cent for Year 1 and 95 per cent for Year 2. The teachers were clearly confident about their work programs. The fact that there were not significant differences by school type on this statement implies that although many EEC teachers were not well qualified in early childhood education, they did not feel that this harmed their work program.

SUMMARY

The three types of teachers rarely differed in their responses to statements about their work program. However, when differences did occur, it was evident that the EEC teachers were practising a more progressive teaching style than were PR teachers. The pupils of EEC teachers were freer to move about the room and to choose their own activities, and the activities of the different year levels were intergrated more often. This was due perhaps either to the pre-school training of many of the EEC teachers, or to the simple presence of the pre-schoolers in the classroom, since the pre-schoolers were treated in a more progressive manner than were the primary school children.

The EEC teachers reported that, compared to primary school children, their approach to the pre-schoolers is more child-centered, more individualised, more activity based, less routinised, more flexible, involves more integration of subject matter, more child choice of activities, more freedom of movement for the children, less orientation to the acquisition of specific knowledge, and more attention to the process of acquiring knowledge. Although the teachers exhibited these differences in teaching style, the approach to pre-schoolers was not any less planned than that for primary school children. This is so even though the EEC teachers tended to concentrate on the primary school children and to delegate much of the work with pre-schoolers to the teacher aide and the parent volunteers.

EEC teachers were asked to indicate whether they integrated the pre-school children with those in the lower primary Years for activities aimed at attaining each educational aim. The majority did integrate for all activities except those related to reading, writing, spelling and mathematics. However, within these areas, it was only in spelling and number operations that appreciably less than half the teachers reported integration.

Table 2.1: Integration of Pre-School and Lower Primary Years in Early Education Classes

Development of	% Integrated
Social and emotional aims	
Emotional control and maturity	91
A positive self-image	93
A positive attitude to school and schooling	96
The exercise of personal responsibility	71
Social skills	98
A moral code	98
General cognitive aims	
Memory	93
Classification	76
Seriation	77
Spatial and temporal relations	86
Thinking	64
Perception	86
Physical aims	
Fine muscle control	77
Gross muscle control	89
Ability to play games	96
Health skills	93
Physical fitness	91
Language aims	
Reading and pre-reading skills	46
Writing and pre-writing skills	43
Speaking	100
Listening	98
Spelling	18

Table 2.1 (cont.)

Development of	% Integrated
Mathematics aims	
Number and number operations	21
Sets and logic	56
Measurement and estimation	47
Knowledge of	
Social studies aims	
Relationships of various groups and individuals within the community and within society	89
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	71
Man's relation to his physical environment	80
Various roles of individuals in the community and in society	93
Rules and cultural traditions within a society	87
Development of	
Art aims	
Basic art skills	91
Appreciation and enjoyment of art	89
Artistic expression	87
Music aims	
Basic concepts of music	98
Appreciation and enjoyment of music	96
Ability to play instruments	98
Singing	98
Movement and dance	100

Table 2.1 (cont.)

Knowledge of	% Integrated
Science aims	
Living things	91
Conservation	93
The earth in space	84
Community aims	
Parental involvement in the education process	81
Links between the school and the home	79

Table 2.2: Statements on the Work Program, Pre-School: Those Answered Only by EEC Teachers

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
7	The objectives set for this year level are well integrated into the general objectives for the school.	14	55	21	10
12	The children take part in activities suited to their ability and interest regardless of year level.	42	46	10	2
13	The activities of children at this year level are shared with children at other year levels.	18	46	34	2
26	I spend less time working with children at this year level than those at other levels.	5	23	39	34
27	I discuss the work program with the principal.	4	25	49	22
28	I discuss utilisation of human and physical resources with the principal.	15	38	40	7
29	The teacher aide supervises most of the activity at this year level.	3	25	41	31
31	The parent volunteers spend most of their time with children at this year level.	19	32	16	33

Note: The statements in this table are not numbered consecutively. This is because they have been extracted from Table 2.5 and to avoid confusion when comparing among Tables 2.2, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 their old numbering has been retained.

Table 2.3: Statements About the Work Program: Responses Significantly Different Between EEC Schools and Pre-Schools

		EEC School %	Pre-school %
	Statement —	The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children	
True:			
	always	3	5
	generally	13	19
	sometimes	42	68
	never	42	8

$\chi^2 = 11.5$, df = 3, $p < .01$

Table 2.4: Statements About the Work Program: Responses Significantly Different Between EEC and PR Schools

	Year 1		Year 2	
	EEC schools %	PR schools %	EEC schools %	PR schools %
Statement –	The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next			
True:				
always	2	6	7	0
generally	28	0	33	0
sometimes	68	68	47	72
never	2	26	13	28
	$\chi^2 = 18.6$, df = 3, $p < .001$		$\chi^2 = 14.8$, df = 3, $p < .01$	
Statement –	The children are free to move from one learning area to another			
True:				
always	7	9		
generally	28	18		
sometimes	65	50		
never	0	23		
	$\chi^2 = 11.8$, df = 3 $p < .01$		N.S	

Table 2.4 (cont.)

Statement — The activities of children at this year level are shared with children at other year levels

True:		
always	37	6
generally	38	28
sometimes	25	66
never	0	0

N.S. $\chi^2 = 9.9$, df = 2.
$p < .01$

Table 2.5 : Statements on the Work Program, Pre-school

		Always true	Generally true	Sometimes true	Never true
		%	%	%	%
1.	The program has an explicit set of general objectives.	41	52	6	1
2.	Specific objectives are set for each lesson or activity.	23	55	22	0
3.	The specific objectives are related explicitly to the general objectives of the program.	29	54	16	1
4.	The work program for the week is planned in advance.	45	36	17	2
5.	The program is structured so that there is systematic progression from this year level to the next highest year level.	28	49	19	4
6.	The work program is highly structured for most of the children.	7	27	52	14
8.	There is a set of explicit objectives for each child.	14	52	30	4
9.	There is a minimal amount of fixed scheduling of activities.	21	48	30	1
10.	The activities are selected on the basis of student interest.	25	61	14	0
11.	The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next.	31	53	16	0
14.	The program for this year level is activity based.	56	38	4	2
15.	Subject areas are integrated rather than separated.	43	43	13	1
16.	The learning environment is rich and varied.	34	64	2	0

Table 2.5 (cont.)

17.	The children are free to move from one learning area to another.	58	36	6	0
18.	I try to be a resource person rather than an authority for the children.	33	57	10	0
19.	I place more stress on how the child masters the processes of learning than on what the child knows.	45	45	6	4
20.	Peer tutoring (children teaching other children) occurs.	13	34	46	7
21.	I monitor the progress of each child.	38	47	12	3
22.	The program adequately caters for children at this year level.	42	52	6	0
23.	Provision is made for special activities for children with particular difficulties or problems.	48	42	10	0
24.	The program is individualised for each child.	16	54	25	5
25.	There is a set domain of content over which the child should gain mastery during the year.	27	36	25	12
30.	The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children.	*	*	*	*

* Responses are significantly different between EEC and PS teachers. See Table 2.3

Note: The statements in this table are not numbered consecutively. The missing statements are those applicable only to EEC teachers and may be found in Table 2.2.

Table 2.6 : Statements on the Work Program - Year 1

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
1.	The program has an explicit set of general objectives.	54	38	8	0
2.	Specific objectives are set for each lesson or activity.	32	50	18	0
3.	The specific objectives are related explicitly to the general objectives of the program.	35	57	8	0
4.	The work program for the week is planned in advance.	47	33	19	1
5.	The program is structured so that there is systematic progression from this year level to the next highest year level.	57	33	9	1
6.	The work program is highly structured for most of the children.	14	64	19	3
7.	The objectives set for this year level are well integrated into the general objectives for the school.	32	55	12	1
8.	There is a set of explicit objectives for each child.	8	34	47	11
9.	There is a minimal amount of fixed scheduling of activities.	3	32	56	9
10.	The activities are selected on the basis of student interest.	13	47	40	0
11.	The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next.	*	*	*	*

* Responses are significantly different between EEC and PR teachers. See Table 2.4.

Table 2.6 (cont.)

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
12.	The children take part in activities suited to their ability and interest regardless of year level.	10	41	40	9
13.	The activities of children at this year level are shared with children at other year levels.	13	31	56	0
14.	The program for this year level is activity based.	6	49	42	3
15.	Subject areas are integrated rather than separated.	9	36	52	3
16.	The learning environment is rich and varied.	14	68	18	0
17.	The children are free to move from one learning area to another.	*	*	*	*
18.	I try to be a resource person rather than an authority for the children.	11	43	45	1
19.	I place more stress on how the child masters the processes of learning than on what the child knows.	19	54	22	5
20.	Peer tutoring (children teaching other children) occurs.	13	25	52	10
21.	I monitor the progress of each child.	51	37	12	0
22.	The program adequately caters for children at this year level.	48	49	3	0
23.	Provision is made for special activities for children with particular difficulties or problems.	43	37	20	0

Table 2.6 (cont.)

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
24.	The program is individualised for each child.	6	34	43	17
25.	There is a set domain of content over which the child should gain mastery during the year.	53	36	8	3
26.	I spend less time working with children at this year level than those at other levels.	3	1	26	70
27.	I discuss the work program with the principal.	15	38	39	8
28.	I discuss utilisation of human and physical resources with the principal.	14	44	34	8
29.	The teacher aide supervises most of the activity at this year level.	1	4	55	40
30.	The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children.	2	8	16	74
31.	The parent volunteers spend most of their time with children at this year level.	3	7	22	68

Table 2.7 : Statements on the Work Program - Year 2

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
1.	The program has an explicit set of general objectives.	40	49	11	0
2.	Specific objectives are set for each lesson or activity.	28	47	25	0
3.	The specific objectives are related explicitly to the general objectives of the program.	35	54	11	0
4.	The work program for the week is planned in advance.	40	32	26	2
5.	The program is structured so that there is systematic progression from this year level to the next highest year level.	59	35	6	0
6.	The work program is highly structured for most of the children.	17	60	21	2
7.	The objectives set for this year level are well integrated into the general objectives for the school.	21	64	15	0
8.	There is a set of explicit objectives for each child.	6	28	49	17
9.	There is a minimal amount of fixed scheduling of activities.	4	35	50	11
10.	The activities are selected on the basis of student interest.	10	45	45	0
11.	The children have a large say in deciding what activity to do next.	*	*	*	*
12.	The children take part in activities suited to their ability and interest regardless of year level.	15	36	36	13

* Responses are significantly different between EEC and PR teachers. See Table 2.4.

Table 2.7 (cont.)

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
13.	The activities of children at this year level are shared with children of other year levels.	*	*	*	*
14.	The program for this year level is activity-based.	6	38	54	2
15.	Subject areas are integrated rather than separated.	8	41	47	4
16.	The learning environment is rich and varied.	15	58	27	0
17.	The children are free to move from one learning area to another.	9	19	55	17
18.	I try to be a resource person rather than an authority for the children.	15	36	47	2
19.	I place more stress on how the child masters the processes of learning than on what the child knows.	19	51	26	4
20.	Peer tutoring (children teaching other children) occurs.	8	26	53	13
21.	I monitor the progress of each child.	49	40	11	0
22.	The program adequately caters for children at this year level.	55	40	5	0
23.	Provision is made for special activities for children with particular difficulties or problems.	40	41	19	0
24.	The program is individualised for each child.	6	33	38	23
25.	There is a set domain of content over which the child should gain mastery during the year.	51	40	7	2

Table 2.7 (cont.)

		Always true %	Generally true %	Sometimes true %	Never true %
26.	I spend less time working with children at this year level than those at other levels.	2	15	23	60
27.	I discuss the work program with the principal.	10	52	32	6
28.	I discuss utilisation of human and physical resources with the principal.	13	50	31	6
29.	The teacher aide supervises most of the activity at this year level.	0	12	46	42
30.	The parent volunteers spend much of their time with their own children.	0	3	9	88
31.	The parent volunteers spend most of their time with children at this year level.	0	3	17	80

EDUCATIONAL AIMS

IMPORTANCE AND SUCCESS RATINGS

In order to determine if the various groups of respondents differed in educational aims and in perceived effectiveness, all personnel involved in both the 1977 and 1978 surveys were asked to respond to a section on educational aims. They were asked to indicate how important each educational aim was, and how successfully it has been achieved. The 43 aims were grouped into 10 categories: social and emotional, general cognitive, physical, language, mathematics, social studies, art, music, science, and community. The aims were designed to encompass the diversity of educational aims espoused by pre-school and primary school teachers, and found in curriculum guides and handbooks used in Queensland schools. A full list of the aims is presented in Table 3.1 (p. 43).

The 1977 teachers rated on a four-point scale, the degree of importance they attached to each educational aim, and the success they felt they had had in achieving that aim for each year level, including pre-school, in their class.

The principals indicated the importance of each aim to them, and how successful they felt the teacher of the lowest class had been in achieving those aims for each year level in her class.

The 1978 teachers were asked to rate the importance of each educational aim for the children coming into their class from the lowest class in the school, and how successfully they felt the children had achieved those aims. They were to respond only for the year level in their class which had arrived in their class in 1978, having spent all of 1977 in the lowest class. In the great majority of cases, these children were in Year 2 in 1978. The number of respondents for higher Years was too small for data analyses to be meaningful, so only the 1978 teachers' ratings of importance and success for Year 2 are presented here.

IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL AIMS

All respondents rated the educational aims on a four-point scale: not important, slightly important, moderately important and highly important. Results of the data analyses were in the form of percentages of teachers regarding each aim as being not important, slightly, moderately or highly important. The results in full, for 1977 teachers and principals, for those cases in which there were no significant differences in responses among teacher and principal types, are presented in Appendix 2. Responses which were significantly different among 1977 teacher types are presented in Table 3.5 (p.50). There were no significant differences in importance ratings between the two types of 1978 teachers.

TEACHERS IN 1977

Table 3.2 (p. 45) gives the aims rated most important and least important by the 1977 teachers. Those classified as most important are those rated highly important by 80 per cent or more of teachers, and the least important are those rated highly important by less than 20 per cent of teachers. Aims that were rated significantly differently among teacher types are not included in Table 3.2.

Areas of consensus among respondents

The two most noticeable features of Table 3.2 are the decline in importance of social and emotional aims from pre-school to Year 2 and a corresponding increase in importance of social studies. Four social and emotional aims were highly important at the pre-school level: emotional control and maturity; a positive self-image; social skills; and the development of a moral code. Emotional control and maturity dropped out of the list at Year 1, and by Year 2 only the development of a moral code remained. The teachers felt that the development of social studies was not an important area for pre-school children: four of the five sub-aims within social studies were felt to be highly important by less than 20 per cent of the teachers. In Years 1 and 2, social studies aims increased to a modest degree of importance but none were highly important at any year level examined here.

Educational aims within the area of language changed systematically from one year level to the next. At all three year levels from pre-school to Year 2, the development of speaking and listening skills was highly important to the teachers. At Year 1, however, two additional sub-aims of language were added: the development of reading and pre-reading skills and of writing and pre-writing skills. It appears that Year 1 is the peak year for the development of reading and writing skills. The teachers apparently felt that the skills developed during this Year formed an adequate base so that other areas of the curriculum could be more heavily emphasised after Year 1. These results are reflected in those for spelling. The development of spelling skills only becomes moderately important in Year 2, after reading and writing skills have been developed.

Mathematics is another area of the curriculum that changes substantially from Year to Year. At the pre-school level, two sub-aims of mathematics were among those aims thought least important by the teachers: number and number operations, and measurement and estimation. Year 2 is the first Year in which a sub-aim of mathematics was seen as highly important. This aim is the development of number and number operations. Mathematics is thus seen to be an unimportant aspect of education at the pre-school level, and only becomes highly important at the Year 2 level. It is clear that the aims that increase in importance most from pre-school to Year 2 are those that comprise the traditional primary school curriculum: mathematics, language arts and social studies.

The changing emphasis on general cognitive skills across year levels reveals the teacher's response to variation in the developmental level of the child. At the pre-school and Year 1 level, the teachers believed the development of perceptual skills to be highly important. In Year 2, however, the emphasis shifted to the higher cognitive process of thinking. Perceptual skills, such as letter discrimination, would have been substantially achieved before Year 2 in the majority of children. The results for physical aims also reflect the teachers' response to the physical and mental growth of the child. At the pre-school level, the development of fine and gross muscle control were highly important aims. By Year 1, gross muscle control is largely assumed to exist, but the improvement of fine muscle control, which is required for writing, still remains highly important. By Year 2 both fine and gross muscle control is assumed and the development of health skills becomes highly important.

The science aims seem to be relatively unimportant: no science sub-aim was regarded as highly important at any year level, and in both pre-school and Year 1, the development of knowledge about the earth in space, a science sub-aim, was regarded as highly unimportant.

The appreciation and enjoyment of music was felt to be a most important aim at the pre-school level, but no music sub-aim was greatly important at any other year level.

Over all year levels, the development of links between the school and the home was regarded as highly important, though parental involvement in the education process was never regarded as more than moderately important.

Table 3.3 (p. 47) shows the educational aims rated most and least important by the principals of the EEC and PR schools in the survey. The principals' responses were very similar to those of the 1977 teachers and will not be discussed in detail.

When the principals' responses are compared with those of the 1977 teachers, it is evident that at the pre-school level the teachers emphasised a greater range of aims than did the principals, while the reverse was the case at the Year 2 level. Thus the principals, when compared with teachers, tended to downgrade the pre-school year and to emphasise the primary school years. This result is not surprising, given that only a negligible proportion of the principals have had training or experience in pre-school education. The differences between principals and teachers, although not wide, do reflect a certain lack of coherence in the early education project. This lack may perhaps be due, in part at least, to the experimental nature of the project.

TEACHERS IN 1978

Table 3.4 (p. 49) gives the aims rated most and least important by the teachers surveyed in 1978. These were the teachers of the class above the lowest class in the school who were asked to rate the importance of the aims for the children entering their class from the lowest class. The great majority of respondents answered for the Year 2 level, and so only the responses for that Year are given here. Because the 1978 teachers rated the aims for children entering their class at the beginning of the school year and the 1977 teachers rated the aims for children at the end of the year, it is most valid to compare the 1978 teachers' responses for Year 2 with the 1977 teachers' responses for Year 1.

Areas of consensus among respondents

Like the 1977 principals, the teachers of the next class (NC teachers) responded quite similarly to the 1977 teachers. Aims rated most important for children entering Year 2 were identical to those given by the 1977 teachers for children at the end of Year 1, in the areas of cognitive, physical, language and community aims. The only difference was in the social and emotional category of aims in which the NC teachers regarded only the development of a positive attitude to school and schooling as being highly important, while 1977 teachers thought that four of the social and emotional sub-aims were highly important. Clearly, the NC teacher differed substantially from both the principal and the teacher of the lowest class in the school in reserving social and emotional development largely for this class.

It appears then, that all personnel included in the survey are in fairly close agreement about the types of aims which are most and least important at the various year levels. Generally, social and emotional aims were regarded as most important at pre-school and Year 1 levels and were still important, though less so, at Year 2. Speaking and listening skills were important at all levels but reading and pre-reading, and writing and pre-writing skills did not become highly important until Year 1. Mathematics aims did not attain a high level of importance until Year 2, and at pre-school were among the least important. Most of the low importance aims cam from the social studies and science categories.

Aims which were of neither high nor low importance to any of the respondents included most of the general cognitive aims (memory, classification, seriation and spatial and temporal relations); all of the art aims; most of the music aims; and two science aims (knowledge of living things, and of conservation). The music and art areas are probably regarded by teachers as being largely aesthetic and hence as of only moderate importance. The cognitive aims, although highly important for subsequent achievement, are probably seen as being somewhat abstract and thus are not rated as importantly as the more concrete areas such as mathematics and language.

Areas of difference among respondents

Some aims were rated significantly differently by the various types of teachers and principals. The aims rated differently by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers for Years 1 and 2 are given in Table 3.5, and those rated differently by EEC and PR principals are shown in Table 3.6. The NC teachers in schools with or without early education classes did not rate any of the aims significantly differently.

Only one aim was rated significantly differently by EEC and pre-school teachers for the pre-school level. This was the development of the ability to play games, a physical aim. This aim was rated moderately or highly important by all EEC teachers, but only slightly important by one-third of PS teachers ($\chi^2 = 14.3$, df = 2, $p < .001$). It may be that EEC teachers felt the ability to play games is more important for pre-schoolers in the early education class situation because of the desirability of interaction outside the classroom between pre-schoolers and children in higher years.

Ten sub-aims were rated significantly differently for their importance to Year 1 students by 1977 EEC and PR teachers. The 10 sub-aims were scattered over the categories of aims, two being from the general cognitive category, two from mathematics, one each from social studies, science and art, and three from music. Only one sub-aim, from the music category, was rated significantly differently for Year 2 students. In all cases, it was the EEC teachers who rated the aims as more important.

The significant differences among teacher types show how the differences between pre-school and primary school philosophies are worked out. The results show that the two philosophies tend to meet at the Year 1 level: the pre-school philosophy has little effect on Year 2, but has a substantial effect at the Year 1 level, while the primary school philosophy has little effect at the pre-school level.

The primary school approach, which has tended to stress cognitive accomplishment, has its main influence in Year 1 on four sub-aims. That is, as Table 3.5 shows, the EEC teachers rated the importance of four Year 1 sub-aims closer to Year 2 levels than did PR teachers. The four sub-aims are: development of memory, sets and logic, measurement and estimation, and knowledge of man's relation to his physical environment. The EEC teachers also rated the development of knowledge of conservation at Year 1 as more important than did PR teachers.

The pre-school approach, traditionally more play-oriented and activity-based, has stressed social and emotional development and aesthetic areas such as music and art. Table 3.5 reveals that the major pre-school impact was on Year 1 in the areas of music and art. The EEC teachers rated the importance of two sub-aims closer to the pre-school level than did PR teachers. These two aims are the development of art skills, and of movement and dance. The development of the basic concepts of music was emphasised to a much greater extent by EEC teachers than by PR teachers at both the Year 1 and the Year 2 levels. In addition, the ability to play musical instruments was rated as more important in Year 1 by EEC teachers than by PR teachers.

Only four aims were rated more important by EEC principals than by PR principals. All were for Year 1 only, as Table 3.6 shows. They were the development of seriation and of thinking (general cognitive aims), of sets and logic (mathematics), and of the ability to play games (physical).

In all cases, the EEC principals tended towards assigning to Year 1 the level of importance for Year 2. That is, the EEC principals thought that these sub-aims should be emphasised earlier than did the PR principals. Thus, unlike the teachers who tended to extend the pre-school approach into the primary school and to emphasise the primary approach earlier in the primary school Years, the principals only tended to emphasise earlier the traditional primary school approach.

There are several general conclusions to be drawn from the significant differences on the importance ratings. In all cases where there were differences among teacher or principal types in the importance they attached to various educational aims, it was the EEC teachers or principals who assigned greatest importance to the aim. Thus EEC schools tend to have a wider variety of educational aims than do either pre-schools or regular primary schools. The differences among teacher and principal types can be largely described by the operation of three principles. EEC teachers tended to emphasise the cognitive aims earlier than did PR teachers, and to extend the aesthetic aspects of pre-school into Year 1, while EEC principals tended to emphasise in Year 1 some educational aims that PR principals would rather leave until Year 2.

SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL AIMS

Areas of consensus among respondents

Tables 3.7 to 3.11 deal with the success ratings accorded to the various educational aims by the teachers and principals in the survey. In the tables, aims rated most successful are those which have a mean success rating of 3.3 or greater, on a scale of 1 (not successful) to 4 (highly successful). Aims rated least successful are those which have a mean success rating of 2.9 or less. These cut-off limits have no intrinsic meaning; they were selected in order to obtain a reasonable distribution of highly successful and less successful aims.

Table 3.7 (p. 54) gives the aims on which the 1977 teachers rated themselves most and least successful for three year levels — pre-school, Year 1 and Year 2. The most noticeable feature of Table 3.7 is the status of social and emotional aims. At all three year levels, the 1977 teachers thought that they were highly successful in achieving the social and emotional aims. The sub-aims reflecting a positive attitude to oneself and to school, and those measuring personal responsibility, and emotional control and maturity were achieved highly successfully.

The next most obvious feature of Table 3.7 is the low success in achieving social studies aims at pre-school. This tendency lessens with increasing year level, so that by Year 2 social studies aims were moderately well achieved. The mathematics sub-aims show a similar trend: mathematics sub-aims were among the least successfully achieved at pre-school, but by Year 2, two of the sub-aims were successfully achieved. These were sets and logic, and number and number operations. The language sub-aims show a milder form of the same trend: spelling was not successfully achieved at pre-school or Year 1 level, but in Year 2 reading and writing skills were successfully achieved.

While the three traditional primary school subjects — social studies, mathematics and language arts — were more successfully achieved with increasing year level, two of the more aesthetic subjects showed an opposite trend. Some art and music sub-aims were highly successfully achieved at the pre-school level, but none appeared in that category for Year 1 or 2. One sub-aim of music ran counter to this general finding: the playing of instruments was among the least successfully achieved sub-aims at both pre-school and Year 2 levels.

The physical aims tended to be well achieved throughout the Years, while the general cognitive aims were only moderately achieved.

One science sub-aim, the development of knowledge of living things, was most successfully achieved at all year levels, while another, the development of knowledge of the earth in space, was least successfully achieved in all Years. Possibly these findings reflect the relatively greater access to living things by teachers and the greater charm of such things as frogs, plants and insects for young children.

Community aims were not well achieved. Parental involvement in the education process was amongst the least successfully achieved aims at all year levels, and links between the home and school was also least successfully achieved at Years 1 and 2.

However, it should be noted that the section of Table 3.7 giving the aims for which teachers felt themselves least successful is almost a duplicate of Table 3.2 which shows the aims that teachers regarded as least important. It appears that teachers have rated themselves least successful in the areas which they regard as unimportant at a particular year level, and hence would not have devoted much time to teaching at that level. For example, although teachers rated spelling as of very low importance for pre-school children and would doubtless spend very little time, if any, developing spelling ability with the pre-schoolers, they have still rated spelling as one of the areas of lowest success at the pre-school level. Possibly, this unexpectedly low level of success is due to the teachers being influenced by the low level of competence of the children in the areas of low importance. That is, some of the areas of low importance, such as measurement and estimation at the pre-school level, are of low importance because of the developmental level of the children. It may not be possible, for example, to make the pre-schoolers reasonably competent in measurement and estimation, regardless of the teacher's effort. Thus the teachers might have rated their success in this area as low because the children were so clearly incompetent in the area, and not because the level of attainment the teachers set for the pre-schoolers was not reached.

However, not all the low success aims were rated as of low importance. Development of links between the school and the home was rated among the most important aims at every year level, and yet it was one of the aims at which teachers felt they had been least successful at Years 1 and 2.

In general then, it appears that the 1977 teachers regarded themselves as having been most successful in the social and emotional area at all year levels, in the aesthetic areas of art and music at pre-school level, and increasingly in the general cognitive, language and mathematics areas with increasing year levels. It is noteworthy that in some cases the level of greatest success in achieving a particular aim fell one year later than the time of greatest importance for that aim. For example, reading and pre-reading, and writing and pre-writing skills were rated most important at Year 1, but teachers did not rate themselves most successful at these aims until Year 2.

Table 3.8 shows the aims for which the principals rated the teachers of the lowest class most and least successful. It is apparent from a comparison of Tables 3.7 and 3.8 that the principals rated the teachers successful in somewhat fewer areas and unsuccessful in more areas, at least at Years 1 and 2, than the teachers rated themselves. Although there was some disagreement about the year level at which the aims were achieved, the principals' and teachers' opinions were similar and thus will not be discussed.

Table 3.9 (p. 60) shows that the teachers of the class above the lowest class rated the teachers of the lowest class as most successful for only two aims at the Year 2 level. These were fine muscle control, and appreciation and enjoyment of art. On the aims for which they rated the 1977 teachers least successful, however, their opinions were almost identical with those of the principals. Even more so than the principals, the NC teachers reported that the 1977 teachers had been less successful in achieving many of the various educational aims than the 1977 teachers felt themselves to be. However, in the areas of parental involvement and developing links between the home and the school, the NC teachers rated the 1977 teachers more successful than the 1977 teachers had rated themselves.

Areas of difference among respondents

Table 3.10 (p. 62) shows those aims for which EEC and PR teachers rated their success significantly differently. In all cases, it was the EEC teachers who rated themselves more successful in achieving these aims than did the PR teachers.

The areas in which the EEC teachers felt they were more successful than did PR teachers covered all of the categories of educational aims with the exception of the social studies, science and community aims. The general cognitive aims were those in which the EEC teachers displayed the greatest difference in success ratings. On all six of the general cognitive sub-aims, the EEC teachers felt they were more successful, at either one or two year levels, than did PR teachers. If these differences in ratings reflect a real difference in accomplishment, the future intellectual attainment of the EEC children is likely to be good indeed.

Some way behind the general cognitive aims in success ratings came the development of art, physical, and language skills, with either three or four sub-aims in each category being rated as more successfully achieved by EEC teachers than by PR teachers. Then followed mathematics, music, and social and emotional development on which either one or two sub-aims were rated as being more successfully achieved by EEC than by PR teachers.

It appears that the EEC teachers felt they were more successful than did the PR teachers in the basic general areas of cognition, language, physical development and mathematics, and also in the more aesthetic areas of music and art. The less basic, more specific, academic areas of social studies and science did not show differences in success ratings. There were no significant differences at the pre-school level. Thus, in the eyes of the participants, the EEC project affects the educational attainment of the primary school children, but not of the pre-school children. One explanation of these results is that EEC classrooms are more successful than regular PR classrooms. There is some evidence in this study to substantiate such a claim. As Chapter 2 showed, the children in early education classes tended to have more freedom in the choice of activity and in movement within the classroom, and the activities of the various year levels in the class were integrated more often. Variations such as these may well lead to variations in the level of achievement of the children in the class. Some research has been conducted on the effect of teaching style on pupil achievement, but typically the variables used to measure teaching style are quite complex. Research, for example, on the effects of progressive or open styles of teaching has often included variables such as student choice of activity and freedom of movement within the classroom, but these are lumped together with other variables also supposedly measuring teaching style. When the results of such research are examined, it is not clear which components of the complex teaching style variables have been the influential ones. The situation is made even more complex by the equivocal nature of the research findings on the effects of progressive/open teaching style (see Bennett, 1976, for a brief review). All that can be said is that the progressive teaching style may have either positive or negative effects on student achievement.

Another explanation of the finding that EEC teachers rated themselves more successful than did PR teachers, lies in the differences in background variables of these two groups of teachers. As Appendix 1 makes clear, the PR teachers are older and have more teaching experience than do EEC teachers, are less likely to have been trained in pre-school teaching, or to have attended in-service courses in early childhood education. The aides too are different in the two types of classroom: the EEC aides are substantially younger than are the PR aides. Because of the small size of the sample, the effect of these and other variables on success ratings was not analysed statistically. However, it does seem likely that younger, less experienced teachers, for example, would be more likely to exaggerate their success in achieving educational aims. Thus, some of the variation in success ratings between EEC and PR teachers may be explained by these differences in sample composition.

Other explanations of the differences in success ratings between EEC and PR teachers can also be found. Two effects could be operating here: the Hawthorne effect and the effect of different adaptation levels. The Hawthorne effect (see Mayo, 1960, for a fuller discussion) occurs when what appears to be the effects of an experimental treatment are really due to incidental aspects of the experimental situation, such as the enthusiasm of the participants in the experiment (the tendency for participants in a pilot project to overestimate the success of the project is an example). Some or all of the apparently greater success of EEC teachers may be due to the Hawthorne effect operating on the teachers involved in the pilot EEC scheme.

Another explanation of the apparently greater success of EEC teachers lies in Adaptation Level theory (Helson, 1964). Adaptation Level theory is simple to illustrate. Take a situation where a teacher has a class of generally dull children in which there is one bright child. The theory would predict that if the teacher were asked to rate the brightness of the bright child, she would tend to base her judgment not only on the 'absolute' level of brightness of the child, but also on how the child compares to the average level in the class. That is, the teacher adapts to the class level and makes individual judgments relative to that level. Thus, the teacher would tend to overrate the brightness of the bright child in a dull class, just as she would to underrate the brightness of an ordinary child in a bright class.

Table A1.2 shows that the average age in PR classes would be generally higher than in early education classes and thus the level of educational achievement of the average pupil would also be higher. When the teachers were rating their success in achieving educational aims at Year 1 level, the Year 1 pupils in early education classes tended to be above the average age and educational achievement of the class, while in PR classes they tended to be below the average age and achievement. Adaptation Level theory would thus predict that EEC teachers would tend to overrate the success of Year 1 and Year 2 pupils, who are above the average class level, while PR teachers would tend to underrate the success of their Year 1 and Year 2 pupils, who are average or below compared to the class as a whole. This prediction holds for both Year 1 and Year 2 pupils: both were rated more successful in early education than in PR classes. The prediction is different for pre-schoolers since pre-school children in early education classes are below the class average in achievement, while in PS classes they are, naturally, average. Adaptation Level theory would thus predict that pre-schoolers in early education classes would be rated lower in achievement than would those in PS classes. The Hawthorne effect acting alone would tend to produce the opposite effect. Thus, we would expect few, if any, positive effects of the EEC on the pre-schoolers. This expectation was confirmed: while 16 Year 1 and six Year 2 educational aims were held to be more successfully achieved by EEC than by PR teachers, only one pre-school aim was thought to be more successfully achieved by EEC than by PS teachers.

Table 3.11 (p. 67) shows the aims for which the EEC and PR principals rated the success of the teachers of the lowest class in the school significantly differently. Again, the greatest emphasis was on the cognitive area (classification, and spatial and temporal relations at Years 1 and 2, and seriation and thinking at Year 2.) Other areas rated differently were basic art skills at Years 1 and 2, and gross muscle control at Year 1. Again, in all cases it was the EEC principals who rated their teachers as more successful than did the PR principals. It is noteworthy that while EEC teachers rated themselves as more successful than did PR teachers on 23 of the 43 educational aims presented, the principals rated them as more successful for only nine of these aims. This difference can be explained in terms of the Hawthorne effect. EEC principals should be less subject to the Hawthorne effect in rating the success of the teacher of the lowest class since they not as directly involved in the pilot EEC project. The NC teachers from EEC and PR schools, on whom the Hawthorne effect should be having very little, if any, influence, did not rate the success of the teachers of the lowest class significantly differently on any of the educational aims.

CONDITIONS HINDERING ATTAINMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AIMS

Perceptions of the teachers' success in achieving a variety of educational aims has been discussed and it was shown that performance sometimes fell below ambition. Teachers in the 1977 survey were asked to rate the degree to which a number of factors hindered attainment of their educational aims and objectives. The factors they were asked to rate are shown in Tables 3.12 and 3.13. On only four factors were there significant differences among the three teacher types. These are given in Table 3.13 (p.71). The proportion of the total teacher sample who rated the various factors a great, moderate, or slight hindrance or not a hindrance at all is shown in Table 3.12 (p. 69). The factors are ranked in decreasing order of their magnitude as a hindrance, based on the percentage who saw the factor as not being a hindrance. That is, the factors at the top of the list are the major hindrances and those at the bottom are only minor hindrances.

Areas of consensus among respondents

A glance at Table 3.12 shows that few factors were rated a great hindrance by many teachers. The time required for programming and planning and the time required for materials preparation, were rated the highest, with only 14 per cent and 18 per cent respectively, regarding them as not a hindrance at all. They were regarded as a great hindrance by 25 per cent and 19 per cent respectively of teachers. The majority of teachers apparently felt that they do not have as much time as they would like to spend on the behind-the-scenes aspects of teaching. This problem could perhaps be solved by the provision of more teacher aides to take the burden of materials preparation and supervisory duties from teachers, thus providing them with more time to plan and to teach. If the problem were so readily soluble, EEC teachers, who are very well endowed with aides, would have regarded these two factors as less of a hindrance than did PS and particularly, PR teachers. However, this was not the case.

The extent of contact with other teachers in similar teaching environments was also rated high as a hindrance: 70 per cent of teachers rated it a hindrance to some degree. It appears that teachers felt contact with other teachers to be their chief source of support. Absences of support from other sources were rated considerably lower as hindrances. For example, the amount of support and assistance provided by the principal, and the level of involvement of the principal in determining the educational objectives of the class were felt to be hindrances by only 37 per cent and 32 per cent of teachers respectively. The degree of assistance provided by the aide was rated a hindrance by only 37 per cent of teachers, although the aide's knowledge or experience was rated a hindrance by 50 per cent. The level of parental acceptance and approval was also rated relatively low as a hindrance: only 14 per cent felt it to be anything more than a slight hindrance, and 58 per cent rated it not a hindrance at all. The degree of assistance from support and advisory services was felt to be a hindrance by 42 per cent of teachers. Thus, almost half the teachers felt that the level of provision of support and advisory services was low enough to lead to significant hindrance in their pursuit of educational objectives.

The third greatest hindrance to teachers was the effect of young children's activities on others in the classroom: this factor was rated a hindrance to some extent by 70 per cent of teachers. One might perhaps have expected that this factor would be more of a problem for EEC and PR teachers than for PS teachers because of the great variation between primary schools and pre-schools in the amount of space available for indoor activities. This did not occur however. Possibly, variations among these school types in the amount of space available for indoor activities was not great enough to change the impact of young children's activities on others in the class. Alternatively, it may be that the effects of variations in indoor space are moderated by the tendency for many EEC schools to locate the younger children outside the classroom for at least part of the day.

Since the effect of young children's activities on others in the classroom was a great hindrance, it might be expected that joint activities by children at different year levels would also be a significant hindrance. Fifty-two per cent of teachers felt joint activities to be a hindrance to some extent.

Several concrete and closely related factors were seen by a comparatively large number of teachers to be great hindrances to the attainment of educational aims. These were the degree of flexibility in the physical play out of the classroom (rated a great hindrance by 20 per cent), the facilities for outdoor. activities (10 per cent), the number of year levels in the class (11 per cent) and the number of students in the classroom (14 per cent). The amount of space for indoor activities (which was rated significantly differently by the teacher types) also fell into this group: if one takes the mean value for the three types of teachers, the amount of space for indoor activities was rated a great hindrance by 26 per cent of teachers. Thus, gross factors such as size of enrolment, age range of students, and the quality of the physical resources were seen by many teachers to be sizeable hindrances to attaining educational aims. Some effort is now being made to improve the physical facilities, both indoor and outdoor, at EEC schools. The hindrance imposed by such physical factors might thus be expected to ameliorate over the next few years.

The provision of teacher resource materials and student resource materials were also rated as hindrances by a relatively high proportion of teachers: 62 per cent and 54 per cent respectively. This is not surprising since many of the schools in the survey are geographically isolated and access to additional resources above those normally provided could be restricted.

The relevance of teacher training was considered a hindrance by 59 per cent of teachers, and the teacher's knowledge and experience in both lower primary school teaching and pre-school teaching were seen as hindrances by 53 per cent. That is, more than half the teachers surveyed felt that their preparation for teaching in their current situation was less than adequate. The uniformity of this response across teacher types indicates that, according to teachers, teacher education is generally inadequate, not only for rare situations such as early education classrooms.

The absence of a set pre-school curriculum and the presence of a set primary school curriculum were rated quite low as hindrances: only 39 per cent and 36 per cent respectively of teachers regarded them as being hindrances. It seems that the relative freedom allowed by the absence of a set pre-school curriculum does not greatly disturb those teaching in the more rigid primary school framework nor does the relative constraint imposed by the set primary school curriculum seem to inhibit those teaching in the freer pre-school situation. Thus, the two patterns of teaching and learning, although far from meshing perfectly, do not seem to be incompatible.

Areas of difference among respondents

The factors rated significantly differently by the three teacher types and shown in Table 3.13, are those on which one might have expected differences to occur. EEC teachers rated their knowledge and experience in an early education class a much greater hindrance than did either PS or PR teachers. Only 15 per cent of EEC teachers said that it was not a hindrance at all, compared with 61 per cent of PS and 69 per cent of PR teachers. It was rated a great hindrance by 28 per cent of EEC teachers. This is not surprising since many of the teachers assigned to early education classes are recent graduates with little experience in either multi-year classrooms or early education classes as shown in Table A1.8. In 1977, the average total teaching experience for EEC teachers was 2.8 years, compared with 7.5 years for PR teachers. Experience of EEC teachers in multi-year classrooms was 1.3 years (5.1 years for PR teachers) and in the pre-school situation, 0.6 years (2.7 years for PS teachers).

The amount of space for indoor activities was rated more of a hindrance by EEC and PR teachers (78 per cent and 85 per cent respectively rated it a hindrance to some extent) than by PS teachers (42 per cent rated it a hindrance). In addition, more EEC than PR teachers rated it a great hindrance (46 per cent and 23 per cent respectively). This result is to be expected since many of the EEC schools were not provided with extra accommodation for the early education class. EEC teachers might also have felt that the pre-schoolers in their classes require a more active program than do the primary school children, and hence need more space.

The number of hours the aide is in attendance was not rated a great hindrance by any PS or EEC teacher, though it was rated as such by 9 per cent of PR teachers. The great majority (94 per cent) of EEC teachers rated this factor as not a hindrance at all. Fewer PS teachers (67 per cent) and PR teachers (38 per cent) rated it not a hindrance. The reason for these differences is clear, since the majority of EEC and PS teachers reported having the services of an aide for more than 25 hours per week, while the majority of PR teachers reported having an aide for only 15 to 19 hours per week (see Table A1.13). Apparently the teachers felt that the service of a full-time aide was adequate but that an aide who worked half time or less provided insufficient help.

The amount of noise transmitted to other classrooms was a hindrance for only 10 per cent of PS teachers, in contrast to 43 per cent of EEC teachers and 57 per cent of PR teachers. The degree to which noise transmission was reported to be a hindrance was not significantly different between EEC and PR teachers, but it was significantly different between PS and other teachers. The explanation doubtless lies in the physical arrangement of schools: unlike primary classrooms, pre school units typically are well separated from other classrooms.

In summary then, the EEC teachers rated themselves more successful than PR teachers on a variety of educational aims, but felt that only two factors hindered their attainment of educational aims to a greater extent: their knowledge and experience in early education classes, and the amount of space for indoor activities. Given the variation in success ratings, these two factors seem to have acted more as inconveniences than as major hindrances.

OPINIONS ON THE EARLY EDUCATION CLASS PROJECT

The teachers of the early education class rated themselves more successful in achieving a variety of educational aims than did teachers of the lowest class in traditional Class 4 schools. Principals of EEC schools rated their teachers as more successful than did principals of PR schools but on a smaller number of aims, and teachers of the class above the early education class did not rate the EEC teachers any more successful than did comparable teachers in traditional schools. Yet some characteristics of the EEC Project hindered attainment of educational aims. Responses to several statements about the value of the Early Education Class Project indicate that the participants feel that the Project is a success.

All EEC respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with eight statements about the early education class. Opinions of all teachers and principals are shown in Table 3.14 (p. 72). It is immediately apparent from a brief survey of Table 3.14 that EEC teachers are almost unqualified in their approval of the scheme, principals are slightly less enthusiastically approving, and teachers of the next higher class less enthusiastic still. However, the great majority of each group indicated approval of the scheme.

The Hawthorne effect provides a ready explanation of the differences among the respondents in their opinions about the EEC scheme. Those most involved in the Project, the EEC teachers, have the most favourable opinions; the principals, who volunteered their schools for inclusion in the pilot scheme, are next most approving; and the teachers of the class above the early education class are least involved in the project and least approving of it. If degree of objectivity is correlated with extent of involvement then the opinions of the NC teachers reflect more exactly the situation than do those of the principals or EEC teachers. If this is so then the pilot Project seems to be working well, although not extravagantly well. The EEC situation produces a number of beneficial outcomes and few, if any, negative consequences according to the relatively disinterested NC teachers.

The first four statements about the EEC Project pertain to the effects of the early education class on the pre-school children. None of the EEC teachers or principals agreed with the statement that the pre-school year is really only a fill-in year and no 'real' work is done, but 8 per cent of NC teachers did agree. Similarly, none of the EEC teachers, and only one principal, disagreed with the statements that the pre-schoolers have a more positive attitude to school and schooling due to the early education classroom, and that the early education class has produced substantial increases in the social skills and social assurance of the pre-schoolers. However, 11 per cent and 5 per cent respectively of NC teachers disagreed with each of these statements. A similar pattern occurs for the statement that the early education class has meant that the pre-schooler has shown great development.

The remaining statements dealt with the impact of the pre-school children on the lower primary school children with whom they share a class. A comparatively high proportion of all types of respondents agreed that the work of the primary school children is disturbed by the presence of the pre-schoolers: 22 per cent of EEC teachers, 19 per cent of principals and 27 per cent of NC teachers.

This is the negative opinion expressed by the greatest proportion of both EEC teachers and principals. Few EEC teachers and principals agreed that in the EEC there is too much emphasis on social and emotional development at the expense of cognitive development, but 32 per cent of NC teachers did agree. A similar pattern of responses occurred for the statement that the early education class has meant that the lower primary school children have not reached a high enough standard in formal studies.

Only a small proportion of all respondents disagreed with the statement that the early education class is particularly beneficial for those lower primary school children not quite up to the standard of their peers: 6 per cent of EEC teachers, 11 per cent of principals and 14 per cent of NC teachers.

The only negative opinion expressed about the EEC scheme by a significant proportion of teachers in the EEC was that the primary children's work is disturbed by the pre-schoolers (22 per cent). However, the extent of disturbance does not seem to have greatly affected the achievement of the primary school children: only 9 per cent of EEC teachers felt that the class had prevented the primary children from achieving a high enough standard in formal studies. For all other statements about the early education class, negative opinion was negligible amongst EEC teachers.

A slightly greater proportion of principals expressed negative opinions about the EEC Project than did EEC teachers, but the most critical of the scheme were the teachers of the class above the EEC class. Twenty-seven per cent of these agreed that the pre-schoolers disturb the primary school pupil's work and about one-third felt that there was too much emphasis on social development at the expense of cognitive development, and that the primary school children had not achieved a high enough standard in formal studies. The greatest amount of negative response to the scheme concerned the effects of the pre-schoolers on the primary school children. Very few respondents felt that the scheme had not been beneficial for the pre-school children. These opinions contrast with the findings discussed earlier in this chapter that the EEC project has had a positive effect on the educational attainment of the primary school children in the EEC class, but has not changed the educational attainment of the pre-school children.

SUMMARY

All personnel were asked to rate, on a four point scale, the degree of importance they attached to a range of possible educational objectives. In addition, the 1977 teachers rated their success in achieving these aims with each year level in their class. The principals also rated the success of the 1977 teachers for each year level. The 1978 teachers rated the 1977 teachers' success for the year level which had just passed into the 1978 teachers' class from the 1977 teachers' class.

There were relatively few aims for which importance ratings were significantly different among teacher or principal types. There were no differences in aims between the 1978 teacher types and only four between early education class and primary school principals. Early education class and pre-school teachers rated only one aim differently for the pre-schoolers, but early education class and primary school teachers showed significant differences in importance ratings for 10 aims at the Year 1 level. These differences indicate that the early education class teachers were extending pre-school emphasis to the Year 1 children and were emphasising some cognitive aims earlier than were the primary teachers.

The 1977 and 1978 teachers and the principals were in fairly close agreement about which aims are the most and least important at the various year levels, although the principals tended to downgrade the importance of the pre-school year compared with the 1977 teachers. This is hardly surprising in view of the minimal level of pre-school training and experience among the principals.

Generally the 1977 teachers and the principals agreed on which aims the teachers had been most and least successful in achieving. The 1978 teachers, however, appeared to feel that the 1977 teachers had been somewhat less successful than the 1977 teachers felt themselves to be, except in the area of parental involvement.

Early education class teachers in 1977 rated themselves more successful than did primary teachers in many areas at both Year 1 and Year 2 levels. The greatest differences were in the general cognitive area, followed by the art, physical and language areas. The early education class teachers rated themselves more successful with the Year 1 and Year 2 children only. No differences in success with pre-school children emerged.

Early education class principals felt their teachers had been more successful than did the primary principals, although in a smaller number of aims. There were no differences in success ratings between teachers of the next highest class in early education class schools and primary schools.

Although it is possible that all the significant differences reflect actual differences in the degree of success with which certain aims were achieved in the lowest class of early education class and primary schools, it seems more likely that some of the differences are artificial. Both the Hawthorne effect, and the effect of differing adaptation levels could account for some significant differences.

The 1977 teachers were also asked to rate the degree to which a number of factors hindered their attainment of educational aims. Only four factors were rated significantly differently by the three teacher types: knowledge and experience in an integrated setting (more of a hindrance for early education class teachers); amount of space for indoor activities (less of a hindrance for pre-school teachers); number of hours the aide is in attendance (a hindrance for very few early education class teachers, more pre-school and many more primary teachers); and amount of noise transmitted to other classrooms (less of a hindrance for pre-school teachers).

All other factors were rated similarly by the three types of teachers. The greatest hindrances were the time required for programming and planning and for materials preparation, and several gross factors such as degree of classroom flexibility, facilities for outdoor activities and space for indoor activities, number of year levels, and number of students in the class.

All respondents from early education class schools were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with several statements about the effects of the early education class scheme on both the pre-schoolers and the lower primary children. The early education class teachers were most enthusiastically approving of the scheme and the principals slightly less so. A significant minority of teachers of the class above the early education class felt that the scheme may have been adversely affecting the achievement of the primary children. However, the great majority of all staff had favourable opinions of the scheme.

Table 3.1: Educational Aims

Social and emotional

Emotional control and maturity, e.g. control of temper tantrums, agressive behaviour, attention seeking

A positive self-image, e.g. self-confidence

A positive attitude to school and schooling

The exercise of personal responsibility through choice and independence

Social skills, e.g. co-operation with others, social assurance

A moral code, e.g. respect for the rights of others

General cognitive

Memory, e.g. recall, recognition and reproduction of actions, songs

Classification, e.g. by function, association, attributes

Seriation, e.g. by size, quantity, quality

Spatial and temporal relations, e.g. position, direction, recognition of shapes, order of events

Thinking, e.g. reasoning, imagination, problem solving

Perception, e.g. auditory, tactile and visual skills

Physical

Fine muscle control, e.g. holding a pencil, hammering, left to right eye movements

Gross muscle control, e.g. jumping, running, balancing

Ability to play games

Health skills, e.g. cleanliness, nutrition

Physical fitness

Language

Reading and pre-reading skills

Writing and pre-writing skills

Speaking

Listening

Spelling

Table 3.1 (cont.)

Mathematics
Number and number operations, e.g. +, –, X, ÷ , and recognition of number symbols
Sets and logic, e.g. grouping objects according to attributes
Measurement and estimation, e.g. length, weight, time
Social studies
Relationships of various groups and individuals within the community and within society, e.g. the school, the family
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society, e.g. co-operation to supply the basic needs of people
Man's relation to his physical environment, e.g. the influence of climate and natural resources
Various roles of individuals in the community and in society, e.g. policemen, doctors
Rules and cultural traditions within a society
Art
Basic art skills, e.g. use of colour, texture, form
Appreciation and enjoyment of art
Artistic expression
Music
Basic concepts of music, e.g. high, low, fast, slow
Appreciation and enjoyment of music
Playing instruments
Singing
Movement and dance
Science
Knowledge of living things
Conservation, e.g. responsibilities towards plants and animals
The earth in space, e.g. the moon, plants and stars
Community
Parental involvement in the education process
Links between the school and the home

Table 3.2: Aims Rated Most and Least Important by 1977 Teachers

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Most Important		
Social and emotional aims		
Emotional control and maturity	A positive self-image	A moral code
A positive self-image	A positive attitude to school and schooling	
Social skills	Social skills	
A moral code	A moral code	
General cognitive aims		
Perception	Perception	Thinking
Physical aims		
Fine muscle control	Fine muscle control	Health skills
Gross muscle control		
Language aims		
Speaking skills	Reading and pre-reading skills	Speaking skills
Listening skills	Writing and pre-writing skills	Listening skills
	Speaking skills	
	Listening skills	
Mathematics aims		
		Number and number operations
Music aims		
Appreciation and enjoyment of music		

Table 3.2 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Community aims		
Links between the school and the home	Links between school and home	Links between school and home
Least Important		
Language aims		
Spelling skills	Spelling skills	
Mathematics aims		
Number and number operations		
Measurement and estimation		
Social studies aims		
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society		
Man's relation to his physical environment		
Rules and cultural traditions within a society		
Science aims		
The earth in space	The earth in space	

* Aims labelled *most important* are those which 80 per cent or more of teachers rated as highly important. Aims labelled *least important* are those which less than 20 per cent of teachers rated highly important.

Table 3.3: Aims Rated Most and Least Important by Principals

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Most Important		
Social and emotional aims		
Social skills	A positive self-image	Social skills
A moral code	A positive attitude to school and schooling	A moral code
	Social skills	
	A moral code	
General cognitive aims		
	Perception	Perception
Physical aims		
Health skills	Fine muscle control	Health skills
	Health skills	
Language aims		
Speaking skills	Reading and pre-reading skills	Reading and pre-reading skills
Listening skills	Writing and pre-writing skills	Writing and pre-writing skills
	Speaking skills	Speaking skills
	Listening skills	Listening skills
Mathematics aims		
		Number and number operations

Table 3.3 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Community aims		
Parental involvement in the education process	Links between school and home	Links between school and home
Links between the school and the home		
Least Important		
Language aims		
Spelling skills	Spelling skills	
Mathematics aims		
Number and number operations		
Sets and logic		
Measurement and estimation		
Social Studies aims		
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society		
Man's relation to his physical environment		
Rules and cultural traditions within a society		
Science aims		
Knowledge of the earth in space	Knowledge of the earth In space	

- Aims labelled *most important* are those which 80 per cent or more of teachers rated as highly important. Aims labelled *least important* are those which less than 20 per cent of teachers rated highly important.

Table 3.4: Aims Rated Most and Least Important by 1978 Teachers

Year 2
Most important
Social and emotional aims
A positive attitude to school and schooling
General cognitive aims
Perception
Physical aims
Fine muscle control
Language aims
Reading and pre-reading skills
Writing and pre-writing skills
Speaking skills
Listening skills
Community aims
Links between the school and the home
Least Important
Social studies aims
Man's relation to his physical environment
Science aims
The earth in space

* Aims labelled *most important* are those which 80 per cent or more of teachers rated as highly important. Aims labelled *least important* are those which less than 20 per cent of teachers rated highly important. Aims were rated on their importance for children entering the 1978 teacher's class from the lowest class in the school. Results are given only for Year 2.

Table 3.5: Aims for Which Importance was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Teachers

		Not Important %	Slightly Important %	Moderately Important %	Highly Important %
General cognitive aims					
Development of memory Year 1	EEC	0	0	18	82
	PR	0	11	47	42
		$\chi^2 = 15.2$ df = 2 $p < .001$			
Development of classification Year 1	EEC	0	4	16	80
	PR	0	14	40	46
		$\chi^2 = 9.8$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Mathematics aims					
Development of sets and logic Year 1	EEC	0	0	18	82
	PR	3	11	39	47
		$\chi^2 = 12.8$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Development of measurement estimation Year 1	EEC	0	3	37	60
	PR	8	19	44	28
		$\chi^2 = 14.1$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Social studies aims					
Knowledge of man's relation to his physical environment Year 1	EEC	2	21	41	36
	PR	14	43	32	11
		$\chi^2 = 12.2$ df = 3 $p < .01$			

Table 3.5 (cont.)

		Not Important %	Slightly Important %	Moderately Important %	Highly Important %
Art aims					
Development of basic art skills Year 1	EEC	0	5	45	50
	PR	17	25	41	17
		$\chi^2 = 19.7$ df = 3 $p < .001$			
Music aims					
Development of basic concepts of music Year 1	EEC	0	0	39	61
	PR	3	29	37	31
		$\chi^2 = 17.5$ df = 3 $p < .001$			
Development of basic concepts of music Year 2	EEC	0	6	19	75
	PR	0	19	55	26
		$\chi^2 = 10.4$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Ability to play instruments Year 1	EEC	0	16	45	39
	PR	17	32	37	14
		$\chi^2 = 14.1$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Development of movement and dance Year 1	EEC	0	0	39	61
	PR	3	17	54	26
		$\chi^2 = 15.3$ df = 3 $p < .01$			

Table 3.5 (cont.)

		Not Important %	Slightly Important %	Moderately Important %	Highly Important %
Science aims					
Knowledge of conservation Year 1	EEC	0	0	18	82
	PR	0	11	37	52

Table 3.6: Aims for Which Importance Was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Principals

		Not Important %	Slightly Important %	Moderately Important %	Highly Important %
General cognitive aims					
Development of seriation Year 1	EEC	0	2	21	77
	PR	0	8	57	35
		$\chi^2 = 14.7$ df = 2 $p < .001$			
Development of thinking Year 1	EEC	0	5	18	77
	PR	3	16	51	30
		$\chi^2 = 18.8$ df = 3 $p < .001$			
Physical aims					
Ability to play games Year 1	EEC	0	4	50	46
	PR	0	26	54	20
		$\chi^2 = 10.0$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Mathematics aims					
Development of sets and logic Year 1	EEC	0	9	9	82
	PR	3	8	43	46
		$\chi^2 = 14.7$ df = 3 $p < .01$			

Table 3.7: Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by 1977 Teachers

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Most Successful		
Social and emotional aims		
A positive self-image	Emotional control and maturity	Emotional control and maturity
A positive attidue to school and schooling	A positive self-image	A positive self-image
The exercise of personal responsibility	A positive attitude to school and schooling	A positive attitude to school and schooling
	The exercise of personal responsibility	
General cognitive aims		
		Seriation
Physical aims		
Fine muscle control	Physical fitness	Fine muscle control
Gross muscle control		Gross muscle control
		Ability to play games
Language aims		
	Speaking skills	Reading and pre-reading skills
		Writing and pre-writing skills
Mathematics aims		
		Number and number operations
		Sets and logic

Table 3.7 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Social studies aims		
Various roles of individuals in the community and in society	Various roles of individuals in the community and in society	
Art aims		
Basic art skills		
Appreciation and enjoyment of art		
Artistic expression		
Music aims		
Appreciation and enjoyment of music		
Singing		
Science aims		
Knowledge of living things	Knowledge of living things	Knowledge of living things
Least Successful		
General cognitive aims		
Thinking		
Language aims		
Spelling	Spelling	
Mathematics aims		
Number and number operations		
Sets and logic		
Measurement and estimation		

Table 3.7 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Social studies aims		
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	Man's relation to his physical environment	Man's relation to his physical environment
Man's relation to his physical environment	Rules and cultural traditions within a society	
Rules and cultural traditions within a society		
Music aims		
Playing instruments		Playing instruments
Science aims		
The earth in space	The earth in space	The earth in space
Community aims		
Parental involvement in the education process	Parental involvement in the education process	Parental involvement in the education process
	Links between the school and the home	Links between the school and the home

- Aims labelled *most important* are those for which the mean success rating was 3.3 or greater. Aims labelled *least important* are those for which the mean success rating was 2.9 or less.

Table 3.8: Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by Principals

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Most Successful		
Social and emotional aims		
Emotional control and maturity	Emotional control and maturity	Emotional control and maturity
A positive self-image		
A positive attitude to school and schooling		
Physical aims		
Gross muscle control	Fine muscle control	Fine muscle control
Language aims		
	Reading and pre-reading skills	
	Writing and pre-writing skills	
Social studies aims		
		Various roles of individuals in the community and in society
Music aims		
Appreciation and enjoyment of music	Appreciation and enjoyment of music	Singing
Science aims		
		Knowledge of living things

Table 3.8 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Least Successful		
Social and emotional aims		
	The exercise of personal responsibility	The exercise of personal responsibility
General cognitive aims		
Spatial and temporal relations		Thinking
Thinking		
Language aims		
Spelling skills	Spelling skills	Listening skills
Mathematics aims		
Number and number operations	Measurement and estimation	Measurement and estimation
Measurement and estimation		
Social studies aims		
Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	Patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	Man's relation to his environment
		Rules and cultural traditions within a society
Man's relation to his physical environment	Man's relation to his physical environment	
Rules and cultural traditions within a society	Rules and cultural traditions within a society	
Music aims		
Playing instruments		Playing instruments

Table 3.8 (cont.)

Pre-school	Year 1	Year 2
Science aims		
The earth in space	The earth in space	The earth in space
Community aims		
Parental involvement in the education process	Parental involvement in the education process	Parental involvement in the education process
	Links between the school and the home	

- Aims labelled *most important* are those for which the mean success rating was 3.3 or greater. Aims labelled *least important* are those for which the mean success rating was 2.9 or less.

Table 3.9: Aims Rated Most and Least Successful by 1978 Teachers

Year 2
Most Successful
Physical aims
Fine muscle control
Art aims
Appreciation and enjoyment of art
Least Successful
General cognitive aims
Thinking
Language aims
Listening skills
Mathematics aims
Number and number operations
Measurement and estimation
Social studies aims
Man's relation to his physical environment
Rules and cultural traditions within a society

Table 3.9 (cont.)

Year 2
Music aims
Playing instruments
Movement and dance
Science aims
The earth in space

* Aims labelled *most important* are those for which the mean success rating was 3.3 or greater. Aims labelled *least important* are those for which the mean success rating was 2.9 or less.

Table 3.10: Aims for Which Success was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR teachers

		Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%
Social and emotional aims					
Development of social skills Year 1	EEC	0	7	47	46
	PR	0	28	58	14
		$\chi^2 = 12.3$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
General cognitive aims					
Development of memory Year 1	EEC	0	0	46	54
	PR	0	28	61	11
		$\chi^2 = 22.5$ df = 2 $p < .0001$			
Development of memory Year 2	EEC	0	0	43	57
	PR	0	10	84	6
		$\chi^2 = 15.3$ df = 2 $p < .001$			
Development of classification Year 1	EEC	0	0	50	50
	PR	0	20	60	20
		$\chi^2 = 13.5$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of seriation Year 1	EEC	0	0	33	67
	PR	0	9	62	29
		$\chi^2 = 12.2$ df = 2 $p < .01$			

Table 3.10 (cont.)

		Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%
Development of spatial and temporal relationships Year 1	EEC	0	2	38	60
	PR	0	17	75	8
		$\chi^2 = 23.3$ df = 2 $p < .0001$			
Development of spatial and temporal relationships Year 2	EEC	0	0	38	62
	PR	0	3	81	16
		$\chi^2 = 9.6$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of thinking Year 1	EEC	0	0	63	37
	PR	6	42	47	5
		$\chi^2 = 28.6$ df = 3 $p < .0001$			
Development of thinking Year 2	EEC	0	0	57	43
	PR	0	31	66	3
		$\chi^2 = 14.6$ df = 2 $p < .001$			
Development of perception Year 2	EEC	0	21	43	36
	PR	0	6	88	6
		$\chi^2 = 10.2$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Physical aims					
Development of fine muscle control Year 1	EEC	0	2	32	66
	PR	0	11	58	31

Table 3.10 (cont.)

		Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%
		$\chi^2 = 10.1$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of gross muscle control Year 1	EEC	0	0	49	51
	PR	0	17	61	22
		$\chi^2 = 11.6$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Ability to play games Year 1	EEC	0	5	37	58
	PR	0	5	78	17
		$\chi^2 = 14.5$ df = 2 $p < .001$			
Language aims					
Development of reading and pre-reading skills Year 1	EEC	0	3	33	64
	PR	0	8	64	28
		$\chi^2 = 10.6$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of writing and pre-writing skills Year 1	EEC	0	2	41	57
	PR	0	22	50	28
		$\chi^2 = 10.8$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of listening skills Year 1	EEC	0	5	59	36
	PR	0	25	64	11
		$\chi^2 = 10.5$ df = 2 $p < .01$			

Table 3.10 (cont.)

		Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successful %
Mathematics aims					
Development of sets and logic Year 1	EEC	0	0	48	52
	PR	0	17	55	28
		$\chi^2 = 10.1$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of measurement and estimation Year 1	EEC	0	10	59	31
	PR	3	34	54	9
		$\chi^2 = 11.5$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Art aims					
Development of basic art skills Year 1	EEC	0	7	52	41
	PR	3	37	51	9
		$\chi^2 = 17.0$ df = 3 $p < .001$			
Development of basic art skills Year 2	EEC	0	6	44	50
	PR	0	34	60	6
		$\chi^2 = 13.7$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of artistic expression Year 1	EEC	0	2	59	39
	PR	6	33	52	9
		$\chi^2 = 19.8$ df = 3 $p < .001$			

Table 3.10 (cont.)

		Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%
Development of artistic expression Year 2	EEC	0	7	40	53
	PR	3	34	60	3
		$\chi^2 = 16.7$ df = 3 $p < .001$			
Music aims					
Ability to play instruments Year 1	EEC	0	19	55	26
	PR	15	41	38	6
		$\chi^2 = 15.0$ df = 3 $p < .01$			

Table 3.11: Aims for Which Success was Rated Significantly Differently by EEC and PR Principals

		Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%
General cognitive aims					
Development of classification Year 1	EEC	2	2	67	29
	PR	0	24	68	8
		$\chi^2 = 12.7$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Development of classification Year 2	EEC	0	0	55	45
	PR	0	25	69	6
		$\chi^2 = 10.7$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of seriation Year 1	EEC	0	5	58	37
	PR	0	16	76	8
		$\chi^2 = 10.7$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of spatial and temporal relations Year 1	EEC	0	7	53	40
	PR	0	19	70	11
		$\chi^2 = 9.4$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of spatial and temporal relations Year 2	EEC	0	0	46	54
	PR	0	13	78	9
		$\chi^2 = 10.6$ df = 2 $p < .01$			
Development of thinking Year 1	EEC	0	9	65	26
	PR	0	47	47	6
		$\chi^2 = 16.5$ df = 2 $p < .001$			

Table 3.11 (cont.)

		Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successful %
Physical aims					
Development of gross muscle control Year 1	EEC	0	2	49	49
	PR	3	17	64	16
		$\chi^2 = 12.5$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Art aims					
Development of basic art skills Year 1	EEC	2	7	58	33
	PR	3	35	51	11
		$\chi^2 = 12.2$ df = 3 $p < .01$			
Development of basic art skills Year 2	EEC	0	9	36	55
	PR	0	38	56	6
		$\chi^2 = 13.1$ df = 2 $p < .01$			

Table 3.12: Factors Hindering Attainment of Education Aims

		Extent to which attainment is hindered			
		Great extent	Moderate extent	Slight extent	Not at all
		%	%	%	%
1.	The time required for programming and planning	25	30	31	14
2.	The time required for materials preparation	19	25	38	18
3.	The effect of the young children's activities on others in the classroom	5	24	41	30
4.	Extent of contact with other teachers in similar teaching environments	14	23	33	30
5.	The degree of flexibility in the physical layout of the classroom	20	20	26	34
6.	The facilities for outdoor activities.	10	29	25	36
7.	The number of year levels in the class	10	21	32	37
8.	The number of students in the classroom	14	22	26	38
9.	The provision of teacher resource materials	8	15	39	38
10.	The integration of subject matter across areas	7	15	39	39
11.	The relevance of the teacher's training	8	22	29	41
12.	The provision of student resource materials	4	18	32	46
13.	Teacher's knowledge and experience in lower primary school teaching	6	22	25	47
14.	Teacher's knowledge and experience in pre-school teaching	7	18	28	47

Table 3.12 (cont.)

		Extent to which attainment is hindered			
		Great extent	Moderate extent	Slight extent	Not at all
		%	%	%	%
15.	The number of parent volunteers working in the classroom	7	8	37	48
16.	Joint activities by children at different year levels	6	14	32	48
17.	Extent of knowledge and/or experience on the part of the aide	3	19	28	50
18.	The degree of assistance from support and advisory services	5	12	25	58
19.	The level of parental acceptance and approval	6	8	28	58
20.	The educational expectations of entering children held by the teacher of the next highest class	5	12	23	60
21.	The absence of a set pre-school curriculum	5	11	23	61
22.	The degree of assistance provided by the teacher aide	4	9	24	63
23.	The amount of support and assistance provided by the principal *	6	5	17	72
24.	The presence of a set primary school curriculum	2	10	24	64
25.	The level of involvement of the principal in determining the educational objectives of the class *	5	7	19	69

Note: Only factors not significantly different among teacher types are included in this table.

* These factors were not applicable to PS teachers. The percentages given are for EEC and PR teachers only.

Table 3.13: Factors Hindering Attainment of Educational Aims and That Differ Among Teacher Types

Type of Teacher	Degree of Hindrance															
	Teacher's knowledge and experience in an early education class[1]				Amount of space for indoor activities[2]				Number of hours aide is in attendance[3]				Amount of noise transmitted to other classrooms[4]			
	Great extent %	Moderate extent %	Slight extent %	Not at all %	Great extent %	Moderate extent %	Slight extent %	Not at all %	Great extent %	Moderate extent %	Slight extent %	Not at all %	Great extent %	Moderate extent %	Slight extent %	Not at all %
Pre-School	6	10	23	61	8	14	20	58	0	11	22	67	0	0	9	91
Early Education Class	28	33	24	15	46	26	6	22	0	2	4	94	2	24	17	57
Primary	0	17	14	69	23	35	27	15	9	26	27	38	3	11	43	43

[1] $\chi^2 = 32.7$, df = 6, $p < .0001$

[2] $\chi^2 = 31.6$, df = 6, $p < .0001$

[3] $\chi^2 = 32.5$, df = 6, $p < .0001$

[4] $\chi^2 = 25.5$, df = 6, $p < .001$

Table 3.14: Opinions of The EEC Scheme from Teachers and Principals in Schools with an Early Education Class

		Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %
1. The pre-school year is really only a fill-in year and no real work is done.	1977 teachers	0	0	11	89
	Principals	0	0	26	74
	1978 teachers	5	3	41	51
2. The pre-schoolers have a more positive attitude to school and schooling due to the early education classroom.	1977 teachers	61	39	0	0
	Principals	53	45	2	0
	1978 teachers	24	65	11	0
3. The early education class has produced substantial increases in the social skills and social assurance of the pre-schoolers.	1977 teachers	70	30	0	0
	Principals	55	43	2	0
	1978 teachers	27	68	5	0
4. The early education classroom has meant that the pre-schooler has shown great development.	1977 teachers	31	65	4	0
	Principals	28	63	7	2
	1978 teachers	8	68	24	0
5. The work of the primary school children is disturbed by the presence of the pre-schoolers.	1977 teachers	0	22	54	24
	Principals	2	17	45	36
	1978 teachers	8	19	40	32
6. In the early education classroom there is too much emphasis on social and emotional development at the expense of cognitive development.	1977 teachers	0	2	63	35
	Principals	0	13	72	15
	1978 teachers	0	32	52	16

Table 3.14 (cont.)

		Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %
7. The early education class has meant that the lower primary school children have not reached a high enough standard in formal studies.	1977 teachers	2	7	36	55
	Principals	2	11	46	41
	1978 teachers	5	31	42	22
8. An early education class is particularly beneficial for those lower primary school children not quite up to the standard of their peers.	1977 teachers	48	46	6	0
	Principals	26	64	8	2
	1978 teachers	27	59	11	3

SUPPORT SERVICES

A variety of support services are provided for teachers. Advisory teacher visits, regional meetings of school personnel, in-service courses, and departmental publications are examples of such support services. To gauge the impact of support services on schools, teachers responding to the 1977 questionnaire were asked to answer two multi-part questions on support services. The first question dealt with the nature of the support service. Teachers were asked to state whether the service had been provided or not and, if it had been provided, to what extent they felt it had been of assistance to them. They were also asked to state what priority they placed on further assistance from each source of support. Responses to this question are given in Tables 4.1 to 4.4. There were a few areas in which responses were significantly different among the three types of teacher. These are given in Table 4.2 (p.82). Some of the sources of support dealt with in the questionnaire were applicable to only some of the school types in the survey. For example, pre-school advisory teacher visits are applicable only to PS and EEC schools. Support services applicable to only PS and EEC schools are shown in Table 4.3 (p.83) and those applicable to PR and EEC schools in Table 4.4 (p.84). Table 4.1 (p.81) gives those support sources applicable to all three school types.

The second question in the questionnaire concerned the areas in which support services may be of assistance, for example implementing curricula, programming, and catering for individual pupil differences. Teachers were asked to rate the level of actual assistance provided by support services, and to state the level of assistance they would prefer in each area. Responses to this section are given in Tables 4.5 to 4.7. Table 4.5 (p.85) gives responses to the questions which are applicable to all school types. Table 4.6 (p.86) gives responses to questions which are applicable to only some of the school types in the survey, and responses which are significantly different among the three teacher types are given in Table 4.7 (p.87).

TYPES OF SUPPORT SERVICES

General support services

Areas of consensus among teachers

From Table 4.1 it is apparent that there are only a small number of support services in which there were significant differences among the three teacher types in the extent to which the service is reported to have been provided or in the perceived degree of assistance provided by the service. The next point to note in Table 4.1 is that a relatively high proportion of teachers stated that the various support services were not provided. For example, only 27 per cent claimed to have been provided with in-service workshops, and only 16 per cent with school-based in-service programs. A further general point is that all teachers would have liked more support than they received from each source listed. The percentage of teachers who placed great priority for additional support on each type of support service was always larger than the percentage stating that they received a great degree of assistance from that source.

Although teachers' responses on the extent of assistance provided by seminars conducted by advisory or curriculum personnel were significantly different among teacher types, the responses on priority for additional support were not. Forty-six per cent of all teachers in the survey placed great priority on support from this source, and another 46 per cent, moderate priority. This makes it one of the highest rated sources of support, in terms of priority for additional support, of all the support services listed in Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4.

Regional meetings of personnel from Class 4 schools, and teacher - or principal-initiated district meetings seem to be regarded by teachers as being about equally valuable. They are rated by 82 and 78 per cent of teachers respectively as being of a moderate to great degree of assistance. Both were given moderate to great priority for additional support by 83 per cent of teachers. Both regional and district meetings were thus rated high among support services, in terms of both assistance provided and priority for additional assistance.

Visits from special support personnel were also rated highly by teachers. A substantial 39 per cent of teachers stated that the special support personnel are of great assistance and 37 per cent that they are of moderate assistance. They were given high priority for additional support by a very large proportion of teachers: 97 per cent gave them great or moderate priority. In contrast, visits from primary inspectors, although received by 94 per cent of teachers, were seen to be of great assistance by only 12 per cent of teachers, and of great priority for additional support by only 14 per cent of teachers. Two explanations can be offered for this low support for visits from primary inspectors. The inspectors have a relatively low level of expertise in early childhood education; and the inspector's traditional role in teacher assessment has a negative effect on teachers' eagerness for assistance from the inspectors.

In-service workshops and school-based in-service programs were apparently not felt to be very significant sources of support. Only 27 per cent and 16 per cent of teachers respectively were provided with these services. Of those who were provided with them, only 21 per cent and 11 per cent respectively rated them of great priority for additional support. School-based programs fared slightly worse than those organised externally, perhaps because they occur more frequently.

The publication Resources Review does not appear to be highly thought of by early childhood teachers either. This publication consists of an irregular series of pamphlets published about three times a year for distribution to primary and secondary teachers. The pamphlets are distributed in bulk to the schools for distribution to each teacher. Resources Review is intended to introduce teachers to recently developed teaching materials and equipment. Each Review contains information on the purposes and content of the new material and a report of the material on trial in selected classrooms. Some recent titles in this series are *Sequential Reading Schemes, Source Materials for Social Studies, Years 3–7*, and *Mathematics Aids for the Primary Teacher*. For a publication which is distributed at the rate of one per teacher it is remarkable that only about half of the primary school teachers in the sample had received Resources Review. Of those who received it, only 8 per cent rated it as being of great assistance, while 42 per cent stated that it is of little or no assistance. Only 20 per cent placed great priority on additional support from this source.

Areas of difference among teachers

Table 4.2 shows the support services on which there were significant differences of opinion among teacher types in the extent to which the service was provided, or in the perceived degree of assistance provided by the service. The obvious point to note in Table 4.2 is that for all services in which there was a significant difference among the teachers, it was the PR teachers who reported receiving the lowest level of support. Only 63 per cent of PR teachers reported that seminars by advisory or curriculum personnel had been provided, compared to 94 per cent of PS teachers and 91 per cent of EEC teachers. Similarly, 33 per cent of PR teachers, 61 per cent of EEC teachers and 78 per cent of PS teachers said that regional meetings of Class 4 schools personnel had occurred; and 31 per cent of PR teachers, 44 per cent of EEC teachers and 69 per cent of PS teachers reported receiving visits from special support personnel such as guidance officers and speech therapists. Even among those PR teachers to whom the service had been provided, the extent of the assistance provided by that service was rated lower than by PS and EEC teachers. Forty per cent of PR teachers reported receiving little assistance from seminars conducted by advisory or curriculum personnel, compared to only 5 per cent of EEC teachers and 9 per cent of PS teachers. It is not clear whether differences in assistance are due to the number of seminars given, their duration, or their quality.

It is difficult to see why these three support services, seminars conducted by advisory or curriculum personnel, regional meetings of personnel from Class 4 schools, and visits from special support personnel, should have been rated differently by the three teacher types when other types of support service were not. However, it does appear that where support services were rated differently, the differences reflect a higher quality or quantity of support provided to teachers of pre-school children, since PS teachers reported the highest level of support, PR the lowest, and EEC teachers fell between the two. Part of this difference in support is doubtless due to the greater emphasis given to advisory teachers in the Pre-school Division. In 1977, there were 24 pre-school teachers for each pre-school advisory teacher, while the ratio was over 100 to 1 in the Primary School Division (Department of Education, 1977). Similarly, the fact that the Division of Special Education provides different forms of support to pre-school and primary school teachers helps to account for the differences in visits from special support personnel. A small group of special education support personnel are available to teachers of pre-school children while no parallel group exists for primary school teachers. Thus in terms of both specialist support personnel and advisory teachers, teachers of pre-school children are better catered for than are primary school teachers.

Restricted support services

Some sources of support are not applicable to all the school types in the survey. For example, visits by pre-school advisory teachers would be received only by PS and EEC teachers. Teachers' responses to questions on support services restricted to PS and EEC schools are given in Table 4.3, and those restricted to PR and EEC schools in Table 4.4 The induction seminar for teachers of the early education class in Class 4 schools, which is applicable only to EEC teachers, is included in Table 4.4.

Table 4.3 shows that virtually all PS and EEC teachers have been provided with the three support services applicable only to them. Pre-school advisory teacher visits were received by all respondents, regional pre-school officer visits by 90 per cent and *Links* (the magazine for pre-school teachers), by 98 per cent. Pre-school advisory teacher visits were the most popular form of support: 39 per cent rated them of great assistance and a further 47 per cent rated them of moderate assistance. By contrast, visits by the regional pre-school officer were rated of great or moderate assistance by 16 per cent and 36 per cent respectively of teachers. Similarly, advisory teacher visits were given great priority for additional support by 45 per cent of teachers, while only 18 per cent gave great priority to visits by the regional pre-school officer. This is explicable in view of the different roles of the two types of support personnel: the regional pre-school officer tends to deal more with the broader administrative aspects of the region while the advisory teacher deals with more specific teaching problems.

Links appears to be regarded somewhat more favourably than the other two support publications mentioned, Resources Review (Table 4.1) and Curriculum Papers (Table 4.4). *Links,* published six times a year is distributed to all teachers of pre-school children. Its content ranges from reports of seminars or workshops on pre-school related subjects to articles by teachers on all aspects of pre-school teaching. It includes reviews of books and other resources, suggestions for activities, and information about the activities of pre-school personnel. Curriculum Papers are irregular and rather infrequent publications on major aspects of the primary school curriculum, and include such topics as 'The Language Arts Materials and Their Use in Primary Schools', 'Introducing Metric Units into Primary Schools' and 'The Deputy Principal in the Primary School'. The most recent Curriculum Papers appeared one year prior to this survey.

Links was regarded as of great or moderate assistance by 31 per cent and 58 per cent respectively of teachers and given moderate to great priority for additional support by 87 per cent. Table 4.4 shows that Curriculum Papers were received by a somewhat lower proportion of teachers (76 per cent) than was *Links*. Of those who received Curriculum Papers only 6 per cent saw them as being of great assistance, 49 per cent as of moderate assistance, and 45 per cent as of little or no assistance. They were given great priority for additional support by only 18 per cent of EEC and PR teachers. These results can be partly explained by the fact that Curriculum Papers have rarely focused on the lower primary school.

Reactions to pre-school and primary advisory teacher visits can be compared by examining Tables 4.3 and 4.4. While only slightly more teachers had received one or more pre-school advisory teacher visits than primary advisory teacher visits, extent of assistance varied greatly. Thirty-nine per cent of teachers saw pre-school advisory teacher visits as of great assistance, while only 15 per cent thought the same of primary advisory teacher visits. The priority attached to additional support was, however, approximately the same. Once again it seems that the support provided by the Pre-School Division, is superior to that given by the Primary School Division. This greater support is due, in part, to more visits by pre-school advisory teachers. This in turn is due to the higher ratio in the Pre-School Division of advisory teachers to classroom teacher. However, part of the difference in support could be due to the fact that primary advisory teachers visit by invitation of the teacher only, while their pre-school colleagues also visit at their own initiative. In addition, pre-school advisory teachers can give advice on the entire pre-school program while primary advisory teachers are restricted to particular subject areas.

The induction seminar for EEC teachers was provided for 98 per cent of the EEC teachers. It was rated as of great assistance by a higher proportion of EEC teachers than any other support service: 41 per cent rated it a great assistance, and 39 per cent a moderate assistance. No teacher felt that it was of no assistance. It was also one of the highest rated services in terms of priority for additional support, with 70 per cent giving it great priority, 21 per cent moderate, and only 9 per cent little or no priority.

The services which were rated highest by teachers are the EEC induction seminar, pre-school advisory teacher visits, visits from special support personnel and regional meetings of Class 4 school personnel. In general then, it appears that the support services which are most specific in their application to the problems teachers are facing are rated most highly by the teachers, in terms both of the extent of assistance they provide and the priority they are given for additional support.

AREAS OF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY SUPPORT SERVICES

Respondents were also asked about the content areas covered by support services. For three areas there were significant differences among the three teacher types in the level of actual assistance reported to have been provided by support services. These areas were programming in general, catering for individual differences, and catering for children with specific difficulties. For one area of support, performing administrative duties, both level of actual assistance and level of preferred assistance were rated significantly differently by the teacher types. Opinions on these four areas of support are shown in Table 4.7 (p.87).

Areas of consensus among teachers

Areas of support which did not yield significant differences are apparent in Tables 4.5 and 4.6 where it is indicated that a very small proportion of teachers rated the level of assistance they had received in any of the areas of support as great. Working with pre-school children (Table 4.6) was rated highest, with 15 per cent of PS and EEC teachers claiming to have received great help, and only 5 per cent stating that they had received none. EEC and PR teachers fared less well in the area of working with primary school children: only 6 per cent claimed to have received great assistance and 16 per cent felt they had had none.

The amount of assistance teachers felt they had received in the various areas can be compared by examining the proportions of teachers who claimed to have received little or no assistance in each area. For most of the areas, this was between 70 and 80 per cent. The only exceptions were as follows: using adult supports (e.g. parents and aides) within the school setting, 66 per cent; working with an early education class, 53 per cent; and working with pre-school children, 39 per cent. Again it appears that teachers of pre-school children (including EEC teachers) are receiving a greater degree of of assistance than are primary school teachers.

In terms of level of preferred assistance, catering for children with specific difficulties was rated highest: 61 per cent of teachers preferred a great degree of assistance. Working with an early education class came next, with 58 per cent of EEC teachers expressing a preference for a great level of assistance. Catering for individual differences was rated of great priority for additional assistance by 43 per cent of teachers, and about 35 per cent placed great priority on assistance in programming, working with lower primary school children and implementing primary school curricula.

Twenty-six per cent of EEC and PS teachers placed high priority on assistance in working with pre-school children, and 55 per cent desired moderate assistance. Although the reported actual assistance in working with pre-school and primary children was very different (61 per cent great or moderate assistance for pre-school, 28 per cent for primary) the level of preferred assistance was almost identical (81 and 82 per cent respectively preferring moderate to great assistance). While PR teachers wanted as much support in this area as did EEC and PS teachers, they received substantially less than did EEC and PS teachers. Clearly, variations among teacher types in teaching experience cannot explain these results and one must again resort for explanation to variations in the provision of support services between the Pre-School and Primary Divisions.

The area rated lowest in terms of preferred level of assistance was liaising with teachers in middle primary school Years, with only 19 per cent requiring great assistance, 29 per cent moderate, and 52 per cent little or no assistance. Presumably this is an area with which teachers feel they can cope without assistance, since it was also rated fairly low in terms of actual assistance received.

It is apparent from Tables 4.5 and 4.6 that teachers generally felt that they received a fairly low level of support from most of the areas mentioned in the questionnaire. Typically, 70 to 80 per cent of teachers reported receiving little or no support. In almost every case, the proportion of teachers preferring a great level of assistance was several times greater than the proportion reporting having received this degree of assistance. There were only two exceptions: liaising with teachers in middle primary school Years, which was rated low in terms of both actual and preferred assistance, and working with pre-school children, which was rated high in both actual and preferred support.

Areas of difference among teachers

The obvious point to note from Table 4.7 is that where significant differences in teacher response occurred, it was the PR teachers who rated the level of assistance provided lowest. In none of the areas of support did PR teachers rate the level of assistance received as great. On the one area of support for which level of preferred assistance was also rated differently by teachers – performance of administrative duties –

PR teachers also rated the lowest among the teacher types. That is, not only did PR teachers report receiving less assistance with performance of administrative duties than did PS or EEC teachers (7 per cent great or moderate assistance for PR teachers, compared to 51 per cent for PS and 20 per cent for EEC teachers), but they also preferred to receive a lower level of assistance in this area (31 per cent great or moderate assistance compared to 87 per cent for PS and 58 per cent for EEC teachers). The differences among the teacher types in preference for help with administrative duties probably reflect the greater administrative load of PS and EEC teachers compared with PR teachers: PS teachers are often in charge of a pre-school unit and EEC teachers are more likely than PR teachers to have an aide to supervise.

PS and EEC teachers reported receiving about equal assistance with programming in general: 38 per cent and 37 per cent respectively rated the level of actual assistance as moderate to great. However, only 15 per cent of PR teachers reported receiving moderate assistance, and none great assistance. Forty-seven per cent of PR teachers felt that they received no assistance at all with programming, compared with only 16 per cent of PS and 13 per cent of EEC teachers. Thirty-seven per cent of teachers stated that they would prefer a great level of assistance with programming, making it one of the most highly rated of the areas listed in Tables 4.5 and 4.6.

In the next two areas of support, catering for individual differences and catering for children with specific difficulties, EEC teachers reported receiving somewhat less support than did PS teachers, though still rather more than was reported by PR teachers. In catering for individual differences, 46 per cent of PS teachers rated the level of actual assistance as moderate to great, compared with 26 per cent of EEC teachers and 15 per cent of PR teachers. Almost 50 per cent of PR teachers reported receiving no assistance. In catering for children with specific difficulties, 49 per cent of PS, 32 per cent of EEC and 11 per cent of PR teachers reported receiving moderate to great assistance, and again almost 50 per cent of PR teachers reported receiving none. The levels of preferred support in both these areas were high (Table 4.5) : 43 per cent gave their preferred level of assistance in catering for individual differences as great, while for catering for children with specific difficulties the figure was 61 per cent. This latter area of support was rated of great priority by the highest number of teachers. This can be expected, given the relative geographical isolation of most of the schools in the survey. Special support personnel such as speech therapists and remedial teachers would not be readily available in these areas and thus more of the load of dealing with special children would be placed on the class teacher.

SUMMARY

The 1977 teachers rated the degree of assistance provided by, and the level of assistance preferred for, various types of support services and in various areas of teaching.

There were few significant differences among teacher types in ratings of the types of support services provided, but where these did occur it was the primary teachers who reported receiving the lowest level of support. It appears that a greater degree of support is provided to teachers of pre-school children than to primary school teachers.

The types of support services rated most helpful, and given highest priority for additional support, were the early education class induction seminar, pre-school advisory teacher visits, visits by special support personnel, and regional meetings of Class 4 schools personnel. These support services appear to have in common that they are geared to giving concrete assistance in fairly specific areas rather than providing more general support.

The services rated least valuable and rarely provided were in-service workshops and school-based in-service programs, and the publications Resources Review and Curriculum Papers which rarely focus on lower primary education and never on pre-school education. *Links,* which is aimed at teachers of pre-school children only, was regarded as very helpful by most of the teachers who received it.

In only one content area did a majority of teachers feel that they had received moderate or great assistance from support services: working with pre-school children. In all other areas the majority had received little or no support. The areas on which teachers placed highest priority for further assistance were catering for children with specific difficulties, catering for individual differences, and working with an early education class.

Again, where differences in the amount of support occurred, it was the teachers of pre-school children who reported the highest level of support.

Notable features of all teachers' ratings of support provided were that a relatively high proportion claimed to have received no assistance from several sources and in many content areas, and that virtually all teachers would have liked a higher level of support than they had received.

Table 4.1: Support Services Provided to all Types of Schools in the Survey

Type of support services	Service Provided		Extent of assistance				Priority for additional support			
	Yes %	No %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %
Seminars conducted by advisory or curriculum personnel	*	*	*	*	*	*	46	46	6	2
Regional meetings of personnel from Class 4 schools	*	*	37	45	17	1	47	36	7	10
Teacher-or principal-initiated district meetings of personnel from Class 4 schools	41	59	21	57	17	5	37	46	13	4
Visits from special support personnel, e.g. guidance officers, speech therapists	*	*	39	37	20	4	73	24	2	1
School-based in-service programs	16	84	11	74	5	10	26	51	17	6
In-service workshops	27	73	21	62	10	7	35	47	14	4
Resources Review	47	53	8	50	36	6	20	54	23	3
Visits by primary inspectors	94	6	12	42	39	7	14	50	25	11

* Responses are significantly different among the three types of teachers: see Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Support Services Provided to all School Types: Responses Significantly Different Among School Types

Type of support service		School type		
		PS %	EEC %	PR %
Seminars conducted by advisory or curriculum personnel Services Provided	Yes	94	91	63
	No	6	9	37
Extent of assistance	Great	26	33	15
	Moderate	65	62	45
	Little	9	5	40
	None	0	0	0
$\chi^2 = 14.2$ df = 2 $p < .001$ $\chi^2 = 15.1$ df = 4 $p < .01$				
Regional meetings of personnel from Class 4 schools Services Provided	Yes	78	61	33
	No	22	39	67
$\chi^2 = 13.5$ df = 2 $p < .01$				
Visits from special support personnel e.g. guidance officers, speech therapists Services Provided	Yes	69	44	31
	No	31	56	69
$\chi^2 = 10.4$ df = 2 $p < .01$				

Table 4.3: Support Services Provided to EEC and PR Schools Only

Type of support service	Service provided		Extent of assistance				Priority for additional support			
	Yes %	No %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %
Pre-school advisory teacher visits to the school	100	0	39	47	14	0	45	39	9	7
Visits by the regional pre-school officer	90	10	16	36	47	1	18	52	29	1
Links	98	2	31	58	11	0	27	60	7	6

Table 4.4: Support Services Provided to EEC and PR Schools Only

Type of support service	Service provided		Extent of assistance				Priority for additional support			
	Yes %	No %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %
Induction seminar for teachers of the Early Education Class in Class 4 schools. *	98	2	41	39	20	0	70	21	5	4
Subject area primary school advisory teacher visits to school.	92	8	15	46	35	4	36	51	10	3
Curriculum Papers	76	24	6	49	39	6	18	53	29	0

* Answered by EEC teachers only

Table 4.5: Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for All Types of Schools in the Survey

Areas of support	Level of actual assistance				Level of preferred assistance			
	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %
Programming in general	*	*	*	*	37	41	21	1
Selecting and scheduling activities	4	19	48	29	27	45	20	8
Using adult supports within the school setting, e.g. parents and aides	7	27	38	28	25	47	21	7
Catering for individual differences	*	*	*	*	43	43	11	3
Catering for children with specific difficulties	*	*	*	*	61	32	6	1
Utilising resources	7	21	53	19	29	51	14	6
Liaising with parents	7	17	36	40	30	38	26	6

* Responses are significantly different among the three types of teachers. For responses, see Table 4.7.

Table 4.6: Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for Various Types of Schools

Areas of support	School(s) applicable	Level of actual assistance				Level of preferred assistance			
		Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %	Great %	Moderate %	Little %	None %
Working with an early education class	EEC	5	42	49	4	58	38	4	0
Working with pre-school children	EEC PS	15	46	34	5	26	55	15	4
Working with lower primary school children	EEC PR	6	22	56	16	36	46	13	5
Implementing the primary school curricula	EEC PR	4	24	50	22	33	53	11	3
Liaising with teachers in middle primary school Years	EEC PR	10	19	23	48	19	29	35	17

Table 4.7: Areas of Support Provided by Support Services for all School Types: Responses Significantly Different Among School Types

Areas of Support	Level of actual assistance	School type PS %	 EEC %	 PR %
Programming in general	Great	3	7	0
	Moderate	35	30	15
	Little	46	50	38
	None	16	13	47

$\chi^2 = 16.9$ df = 6 $p < .01$

Areas of Support	Level of actual assistance	PS %	EEC %	PR %
Catering for individual differences	Great	5	4	0
	Moderate	41	22	15
	Little	43	54	36
	None	11	20	49

$\chi^2 = 18.7$ df = 6 $p < .01$

Areas of Support	Level of actual assistance	PS %	EEC %	PR %
Catering for children with specific difficulties	Great	11	4	0
	Moderate	38	28	11
	Little	32	48	40
	None	19	20	49

$\chi^2 = 17.9$ df = 6 $p < .01$

Table 4.7 (cont.)

Areas of support	Level of actual assistance	School type		
		PS	EEC	PR
		%	%	%
Performing administrative duties	Great	16	11	0
	Moderate	35	9	7
	Little	30	53	37
	None	19	27	56

$\chi^2 = 26.4$ df = 6 $p < .001$

Areas of support	Level of preferred assistance	School type		
		PS	EEC	PR
		%	%	%
Performing administrative duties	Great	46	28	7
	Moderate	41	30	24
	Little	5	35	48
	None	8	7	21

$\chi^2 = 25.1$ df = 6 $p < .001$

TEACHER AIDES AND PARENT VOLUNTEERS

Teachers, in this survey do not typically work alone in the classroom. Teacher aides are provided at all the schools, and in many cases, parent volunteers also assist. The 1977 teachers were asked a number of questions about the activities of the teacher aide and parent volunteers in their class. Details of the aide's involvement in the teaching program, the activities of the aide, and the deployment of the EEC aide are given in Tables 5.1 to 5.3. Details of parental involvement are given in Tables 5.4 to 5.8.

TEACHER AIDES

The three types of schools in this survey differ in the extent to which teacher aides are used. Typical Class 4 primary schools without pre-school enrolments have one or more aides employed for a total of 15 hours week. Schools participating in the Early Education Class Project have been provided with an additional 15 hours a week of teacher aide time, specifically to assist the teacher of the early education class. Pre-school units at the time of the survey had one full-time aide employed for each teacher.

In the 1977 questionnaire, information was sought from teachers on the deployment of the aide's services in their class. Teachers of early education classes were asked to refer in their answers to the aide provided specifically for them. Some biographical information on the aide was also requested, and this information can be found in Appendix 1.

Table 5.1 (p.93) indicates a higher degree of participation by the aide in both planning and executing the teaching program among PS aides than among PR aides. EEC aides generally fell somewhere between the two. Thirty-two per cent of PS teachers reported that the aide is always involved in program planning, while only 15 per cent of EEC teachers and no PR teachers reported this. Sixty-five per cent of PS teachers and 61 per cent of EEC teachers, but only eight per cent of PR teachers, said that they always discuss the program with the aide. Similarly, 84 per cent of PS teachers and 98 per cent of EEC teachers said that the aide sometimes initiates activities with the children, while only 55 per cent of PR aides sometimes initiate activities and 42 per cent never do.

It might be expected that this apparent difference in the degree of responsibility conferred on the aide in the different types of schools would be reflected in the nature of the aide's duties. However, this is not the case. There were no significant differences among school types in the proportion of the aide's time devoted to clerical or domestic duties, supervisory duties, giving formal lessons and giving informal lessons. Table 5.2 (p.94) shows the proportion of the aide's time devoted to these activities. It is obvious that very few aides spent much of their time giving formal lessons: 93 per cent spent one-quarter or less of their time on this. There was a somewhat higher aide involvement in giving informal lessons: 32 per cent spent more than one-quarter of their time in this activity. Twelve per cent spent three-quarters or more of their time in materials preparation and clerical or domestic duties, and 18 per cent spent the same proportion of time in supervisory (monitorial) duties.

There are several possible explanations for the more responsible role played by the PS and EEC aides, compared with the PR aides. One is that significantly more PS aides have formal aide qualifications (Table A1.12) and hence, were given a more autonomous role by the teachers they assisted. However, this does not explain the differences between EEC and PR aides. Another explanation is that because PS and EEC aides were dealing with pre-school children who require less formal teaching and more activity based learning experiences, the aides were more able to cope with the activities required and were given more freedom to do so. If this were the case, one would expect some difference in the types of activities reported for the aides, with PR aides being involved more in supervisory duties and materials preparation and PS and EEC aides more involved with giving informal lessons. This did not occur, and in addition, relatively few (20 per cent) EEC aides were reported as spending all or almost all of their time with the pre-school children when they were in attendance (Table 5.3).

The simplest and most likely explanation for the PS and EEC aides' greater participation in planning and executing the teaching program is that in these two types of schools, the aide is assigned to an individual teacher. In PR schools, the aide is available to assist all teachers. Hence, the PR aide would spend less time with the teacher of the lowest class and would not develop such a close working relationship with her, and thus would be consulted less often about the teaching program.

Table 5.3 (p.94) gives details of the deployment of the early education class aide. Sixty per cent of EEC teachers reported that the aide spent all or almost all of her time with the class when the pre-school children were present. This leaves over one-third of early education aides who spent less than all their time with the early education class when the pre-schoolers were present. This is a surprisingly large proportion since the aides were allocated to those schools specifically for the early education classes. When the pre-schoolers were not present, only 33 per cent of aides spent all or almost all of their time with the early education class, while 36 per cent spent one-quarter or less of their time with it. Thus, when pre-schoolers are present, about 60 per cent of the EEC schools allocate the aide to the EEC class all or almost all of the time, while this occurs only about one-third of the time when the pre-schoolers are not present.

As expected, the early education aide spent more time with the pre-schoolers in the early education class than with the primary children. Ninety per cent of the aides spent half or more than half of their time with the pre-schoolers. This allocation of the aide's time would free the teacher to deal with the more formal learning required in the primary school Years.

PARENT VOLUNTEERS

Tables 5.4 to 5.8 reveal that the extent of parental participation in EEC schools typically falls between that in PS schools and that in PR schools. PS teachers reported a high level of parental participation, and PR teachers, generally a very low level. No PR teacher reported parents being in the classroom more than one-quarter of the time and 89 per cent said parents were almost never present. This contrasts with 52 per cent of EEC teachers and only 8 per cent of PS teachers who said parents were almost never present. A relatively high proportion of PS teachers (49 per cent) had parents present three-quarters or more of the time, compared with only 9 per cent of EEC teachers (Table 5.4 p. 95). Table 5.5 (p.95) shows that the most common number of parent volunteers present at any one time is one for PS and EEC classes and none for PR classes. A small percentage of teachers reported having two present at once, and none had three.

Teachers were asked whether they had a roster for their parent volunteers. As might be expected, 80 per cent of PR teachers said they had not, but only 53 per cent of EEC teachers and 26 per cent of PS teachers had not. Similarly, when asked if their school had a parent education program, all PR teachers, 76 per cent of EEC teachers and 34 per cent of PS teachers answered that it had not.

These differences in the use of parent volunteers in the classroom seem to reflect differences in approaches between primary and pre-school education in Queensland. The Pre-School Division stresses school-community relationships and the role of adults interacting with children in the classroom while the Primary Division tends to stress the didactic role of the teacher.

The low level of parental involvement as classroom volunteers in PR schools is reflected, though not so strongly, in parental involvement in other activities. Table 5.7 (p.97) shows that 31 per cent of PR teachers reported that few or no parents take part in excursions, and 32 per cent report that few or no parents provide extra resources for the class. This contrasts with the 94 per cent who said that few or no parents act as classroom volunteers. However, parental involvement in excursions and provision of extra resources is still lower for PR parents than for EEC or PS parents: 41 per cent of PS teachers, 24 per cent of EEC teachers, and only 11 per cent of PR teachers reported that almost all parents are involved in excursions. Similarly, 46 per cent of PS teachers, 33 per cent of EEC teachers and only 14 per cent of PR teachers reported that almost all parents provide extra resources.

One possible explanation of these differences in parental participation among the three types of schools is that parental participation is related to the number of pre-school children in the classroom. When all the children are pre-schoolers, as in pre-schools, parental participation is high; when none of the children are pre-schoolers, as in primary schools, parental participation is minimal; when some, but not all children in the class are pre-schoolers, as in EEC schools, parental participation is moderate. In order to test this hypothesis, each variable measuring parental participation (Tables 5.4 to 5.7) was manipulated. The frequency distribution for the PS teachers was weighted by the proportion of pre-schoolers in the average early education class (456), and the frequency distribution for the PR teachers was likewise weighted by the proportion of primary school children in the average early education class (.544). These two weighted frequency distributions were then summed to yield a new frequency distribution. This derived frequency distribution was the frequency distribution that would have occurred for early education classes if parental participation were simply a function of the proportion of pre-school children in the class. The derived (or 'expected') frequency distribution was then compared statistically against the actual frequency distribution for EEC schools on that variable. In all but one case, the actual and expected frequencies were not significantly different. Thus, for all but one index of parental participation, the extent and nature of parental participation can be explained by a simple formula: the more pre-schoolers there are in a class, the more the parents participate.

The one exception to this rule is for excursions (see Table 5.7). The proportion of pre-schoolers in a class does not predict the extent to which parents participate in excursions. The reason for this anomaly is not immediately apparent.

Table 5.8 (p.98) shows the proportion of the parent volunteers' time spent in various classroom activities. There are no significant differences in the way parents spend their time in the classroom among the three types of schools. The activity which consumed most of the parent volunteers' time was supervisory duties. Forty per cent of teachers reported that their parent volunteers spend three-quarters or more of their time supervising the children. No parents were reported as spending as much time on materials preparation and clerical or domestic duties, nor on giving formal lessons. However, seven per cent of teachers reported that parent volunteers spend three-quarters or more of their time in giving informal lessons.

Comparing Tables 5.8 and 5.2 (activities of the aide), it can be seen that 12 per cent of aides were reported to spend three-quarters or more of their time in materials preparation and domestic and clerical duties but no parent volunteers did these activities. The differences between aides and parents in giving formal or informal lessons were not significant: two per cent of aides and no parents spent three-quarters or more of their time on formal lessons, and 10 per cent of aides and 7 per cent of parents spent three-quarters or more of their time on informal lessons. However, a much greater proportion of the parent volunteers' time was reported to be taken up with supervisory activity than was the case for the aide: 18 per cent of teachers reported that their aides spent three-quarters or more of their time on supervision, compared with 40 per cent for the parent volunteers. It appears that teachers used their aides principally for materials preparation and clerical or domestic duties and only secondarily for class supervision, while parent volunteers acted principally as supervisors. Neither group gave formal lessons, but both gave infrequent informal lessons.

SUMMARY

Significant differences among teacher types were found in the degree of responsibility conferred on the teacher aide. Fewer primary teachers than early education class or pre-school teachers reported that the aide was involved in program planning or execution, or that the aide sometimes initiated activities with the children. These differences were attributed to the closer working relationship of the pre-school and early education class teachers and their aides. Both of these types of teachers theoretically have the services of an aide full-time, whereas primary teachers have to share an aide with the other classes in the school.

It was expected that the aide's duties would be different among school types, but this was not found to be the case. Nor were there any differences among school types in the kinds of activities of parent volunteers. However, parental involvement was reported to be very low by primary teachers, and quite high by pre-school teachers, while early education class teachers fell between the two. It was shown that parental involvement was correlated with the number of pre-school children in the class. When the roles of the teacher aide and the parent volunteer were contrasted, it became apparent that parents were used more often for supervisory duties and aides more often for materials preparation, and clerical and domestic duties.

Table 5.1: Aide Involvement in the Teaching Program

Aide involvement	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
The aide is involved in program planning			
always	32	15	0
sometimes	65	65	31
never	3	20	69
$\chi^2 = 47.6$, df = 4, $p < .0001$			
The aide initiates activities with the children			
always	8	2	3
sometimes	84	98	55
never	8	0	42
$\chi^2 = 31.4$, df = 4, $p < .0001$			
The teacher discusses the program with the aide			
always	65	61	8
sometimes	35	39	61
never	0	0	31
$\chi^2 = 44.7$, df = 4, $p < .0001$			

Table 5.2: Activities of the Aide

Aide's activity	Proportion of the aide's time			
	All or almost all %	About three-quarters %	About half %	About a quarter or less %
Materials preparation, clerical or domestic duties	2	10	38	50
Supervisory duties	4	14	41	41
Giving formal lessons	1	1	5	93
Giving informal lessons	3	7	22	68

Table 5.3: Proportion of Early Education Class Aide's Time Spent With that Class

	Proportion of aide's time			
	All or almost all %	About three-quarters %	About half %	About a quarter or less %
Pre-school children present	63	19	11	7
Pre-school children not present	33	20	11	36
Proportion of aide's time spent with pre-school children	20	22	48	10

Table 5.4: Presence of Parent Volunteers in the Classroom

Parent volunteers are present	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Virtually always	22	7	0
About three-quarters of the time	27	2	0
About half the time	19	13	0
About a quarter of the time	24	26	11
Almost never	8	52	89

$\chi^2 = 60.1$, df = 8, $p < .0001$

Table 5.5: Number of Parent Volunteers

Number of parent volunteers present at any one time	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
None	0	35	60
One	91	65	30
Two	9	0	10
Three or more	0	0	0

$\chi^2 = 24.6$, df = 4, $p < .001$

Table 5.6: Organisation of Parent Volunteers

Organisation	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Is there a roster for the volunteers?			
Yes	74	47	20
No	26	53	80
$\chi^2 = 11.4$, df = 2, p < .01			
Is there a parent education program?			
Yes	66	24	0
No	34	76	100
$\chi^2 = 21.1$, df = 2, p < .0001			

Table 5.7: Parent Participation in Various Areas

Number of parents participating in each area		School type		
		Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
		%	%	%
Excursions				
	Almost all	41	24	11
	About three-quarters	19	12	22
	About half	27	26	25
	About a quarter	13	33	11
	Very few or none	0	5	31
	$\chi^2 = 31.1$, df = 8, $p < .001$			
Provision of extra resources				
	Almost all	46	33	14
	About three-quarters	32	15	11
	About half	16	28	17
	About a quarter	3	20	26
	Very few or none	3	4	32
	$\chi^2 = 34.9$, df = 8, $p < .0001$			
Parental pre-school group				
	Almost all	11	16	–
	About three-quarters	8	8	–
	About half	16	5	–
	About a quarter	57	6	–
	Very few or none	8	65	–
	$\chi^2 = 34.4$, df = 4, $p < .001$			

Table 5.7 (cont.)

	School type		
	Pre-school %	Early Education Class %	Primary %
Work as volunteers in the classroom			
Almost all	22	7	0
About three-quarters	32	9	0
About half	19	15	0
About a quarter	22	27	6
Very few or none	5	42	94

$\chi^2 = 65.5$, df = 8, $p < .001$

Table 5.8: Activities of Parent Volunteers

Volunteers' activities	Proportion of volunteers' time			
	All or almost all %	About three-quarters %	About half %	About a quarter or less %
Materials preperation, clerical or domestic duties	0	0	11	89
Supervisory duties	16	24	31	28
Giving formal lessons	0	0	2	98
Giving informal lessons	3	4	26	67

ADMINISTRATION OF EARLY EDUCATION CLASS SCHOOLS

Principals of EEC schools in the 1977 survey were asked two questions about the administration of the early education class, and their involvement with the class. In the first question, principals were given a list of various aspects of the early education class, such as the noise level, the provision of indoor facilities, timetabling, and encouraging parental support. The principals were then asked to state to what extent each aspect had caused them difficulties. Responses to this question are given in Table 6.1 (p.103). The second question was intended to gauge the degree of involvement of the principal with the early education class. Principals were asked to rate how often they had engaged in a number of activities, such as observing the class, discussing the work program with the EEC teacher and assisting the EEC teacher in implementing primary school curricula. Responses to this question are given in Table 6.2 (p. 104).

ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFICULTIES WITH THE EARLY EDUCATION CLASS

Table 6.1 is arranged in decreasing order of difficulty, based on the 'no difficulties' category. That is, items which were rated by the largest number of principals as presenting some degree of difficulty are at the top of the table, and items rated by small numbers as presenting difficulties are at the bottom.

It is immediately apparent that of those potential problems listed in the questionnaire, by far the greatest was finding storage space for the new equipment provided for the pre-schoolers. Sixty-three per cent rated this a great difficulty and only 2 per cent claimed to have had no difficulties. Providing indoor facilities was also rated high, with 22 per cent regarding it as presenting great difficulties, 70 per cent moderate or slight difficulties and only 8 per cent no difficulties. Arranging accommodation for the extra children was regarded as presenting no difficulties by 25 per cent of principals, but a comparatively high 13 per cent rated it a great difficulty. Providing outdoor facilities was also rated a great difficulty by 13 per cent, although 33 per cent saw it as presenting no difficulties. Noise level, which might have been expected to increase substantially with the introduction of pre-schoolers, presented moderate rather than great difficulties. Only nine per cent considered noise level a great difficulty while 39 per cent felt it caused no difficulties. It appears then that the physical aspects of the introduction of early education classes have provided principals with some of the greatest problems. This outcome was regarded as likely, since it was decided not to physically alter any of the pilot schools before the project began, but rather to let specific deficiencies show themselves as the Project progressed. Since the time of questionnaire application, a significant effort has been made to remedy the major physical shortcomings that have appeared in the EEC situation. Thus, the present difficulties that principals encounter with physical facilities are probably somewhat less than the questionnaire responses indicate.

The extent of the principal's knowledge and experience in early childhood education was also rated high as a difficulty: only 6 per cent did not see it as presenting difficulties. Of those 94 per cent who did, however, 44 per cent saw it as only a slight difficulty, and 17 per cent as a great difficulty. It is doubtless because of their inexperience in early childhood education in particular, that 27 per cent of principals had moderate to great difficulty in assisting in the professional development of the EEC teacher. Extent of teaching experience on the part of the EEC teacher was another relatively highly rated aspect: 11 per cent felt it presented great difficulties and 63 per cent moderate or slight difficulties. This is hardly surprising since many of the teachers assigned to the early education classes are recent graduates with very little experience with either multi-year classrooms or with pre-school and lower primary teaching (see Table A1.8). In addition, over one third of the EEC principals and teachers had never attended an in-service course in early childhood education. Some of the difficulties due to inexperience may have been alleviated by attendance at such courses.

Encouraging parental support and participation seemed to present some principals with difficulties. Thriteen per cent reported that encouraging parental support caused them great difficulties and 11 per cent reported that encouraging parent volunteers to work in the early education class caused great difficulties. However, almost half felt that encouraging parent volunteers caused no difficulties. These figures reflect those discussed in Chapter 5, where it was shown that EEC teachers had many more parent volunteers working in the classroom than did PR teachers, but far less than did pre-school teachers. Only 7 per cent rated parental concern about the attainment of their primary school children in the early education class a great difficulty, but 56 per cent rated it a moderate or slight difficulty. More than 60 per cent of principals felt that parents were concerned about the negative effects of the pre-schoolers on their children's academic achievement.

Twenty-eight per cent of principals encountered moderate to great difficulty in clarifying the areas of responsibility of the principal and the EEC teacher. The difficulty is possibly due to the minority of EEC teachers who are pre-school trained only. Pre-school teachers are accustomed to being far more autonomous than are primary school teachers and many would tend to make decisions that the principal would feel either lay in his preserve or on which he should be consulted.

Obtaining sufficient assistance from specialist support services such as guidance officers and speech therapists was rated a great difficulty by 19 per cent of principals, a slight to moderate difficulty by 43 per cent and not a difficulty by 38 per cent. This relatively high rating would probably be due to the geographical isolation of the schools piloting the early education class scheme.

Timetabling, although reported as causing great difficulties by only 2 per cent of principals, was rated a moderate difficulty by 17 per cent and a slight difficulty by 49 per cent. Most other general administrative duties such as allocating teaching loads among the staff, obtaining sufficient professional advice from advisory teachers and selecting the teacher aide for the early education class were rated as providing no difficulties by more than half of the principals.

Chapter 2 revealed that the classroom teachers felt there was a certain lack of integration of pre-school objectives with those of the school as a whole. Apparently, the principals agree. About half of the principals found the co-ordination of pre-school and primary school aims to be a problem. Fifty-three per cent encountered some difficulty in integrating the pre-school aims with those of the school as a whole, and 43 per cent had some problems in co-ordinating the progression from pre-school through to the primary school. The lack of experience of principals in either pre-school or early childhood education may account for much of the lack of co-ordination. Co-ordination is vital to the success of the EEC project and is an area that could well be covered in an in-service course for EEC principals. However, while co-ordination of pre-school and primary approaches to education is essential in EEC schools, the two approaches to education are so different that full integration may be neither desirable nor possible.

It appears that staff morale in the new situation was not a great problem. Only 4 per cent reported having great difficulties maintaining morale, while 63 per cent felt it presented no difficulties. Seeking funds for additional facilities from the P & C organisation was another area which presented few principals with difficulties: only 4 per cent felt it presented anything more than a slight difficulty and 65 per cent reported that it gave them no difficulties.

In general then, the areas presenting principals with the greatest difficulties were those related to the provision of space and physical facilities for the pre-schoolers and their equipment. Almost all principals felt that their lack of experience in early childhood education caused them some difficulties and three-quarters felt that the EEC teacher's lack of experience also caused problems. Parental support and participation presented difficulties for a fairly high proportion of principals, although seeking funds from the P & C organisation gave the majority of principals no problems. Maintaining staff morale was a problem for about one-third of principals, though very rarely a great problem. Few general administrative aspects of the early education class were rated as presenting any difficulties by more than half of the principals, except timetabling, which caused problems for 68 per cent of respondents.

PRINCIPAL'S INVOLVEMENT WITH THE EARLY EDUCATION CLASS

The activities presented in Table 6.2 are not arranged in any order of magnitude but are grouped into types of activity. It is immediately apparent that the majority of principals have had little contact with EEC schools other than their own. Sixty-eight per cent have never observed early education classes at other schools, or observed at a pre-school centre. Only one principal claimed to have done these things often, while 30 per cent said they had sometimes done them. Seventeen per cent had never discussed problems with principals of other EEC schools, although about one-third said they had done this often and about half had done it sometimes.

With the exception of teaching or supervising in the early education class, and supervising lesson preparation for the early education class, it appears that the principals are fairly heavily involved with the early education class. Seventeen per cent reported never teaching or supervising the class, but 77 per cent had done so sometimes and 6 per cent often. Thirty per cent claimed to have never supervised lesson preparation for the early education class, though 62 per cent had done so sometimes, and 8 per cent often.

All principals said they had observed their early education class at some time and 62 per cent reported observing it often. Relatively high proportions of principals claimed to have often discussed various aspects of the EEC program with the EEC teacher. However, as Chapter 2 shows, the responses of teachers to similar questions indicate that while the primary school component of the program is often discussed, the pre-school component is infrequently discussed. More than 50 per cent of principals said they often discussed the use of the resources in the school and the EEC work program with the EEC teacher, and 32 per cent often discussed the philosophy and practices of pre-school education with her. Fifty-one per cent also stated that they often assisted the EEC teacher in implementing the primary school curricula. These figures reflect the dual facts that the EEC teachers are often recent graduates and that almost half have either no training in primary education or none in pre-school education. Only 21 per cent of principals reported often discussing the respective roles of principal and teacher with the EEC teacher, but 75 per cent stated that they did sometimes.

Only one principal claimed to have never discussed problems with advisory and support personnel, while 30 per cent had done this often and 68 per cent sometimes.

It seems then, that the principals discuss the early education class with its teacher fairly frequently, and a large proportion often observe the class in operation. Relatively few are involved more actively in teaching or supervising the class, or supervising lesson preparation for it. Few have observed pre-school or early education classes in other schools, but about one-third have often discussed problems with other EEC principals, or with advisory and support personnel.

110

SUMMARY

Principals of EEC schools were asked about the degree of their involvement with the early education class, and about any aspects of its administration which had caused them difficulties.

It appeared that most principals discussed the early education class with its teacher and observed it in operation fairly often, although few reported being actively involved in teaching or supervising the class or supervising lesson preparation for it. Few had observed other early education classes in operation, although about one-third claimed to often discuss problems related to the class with other early education class principals and advisory personnel.

The greatest administrative problems were caused by the physical difficulties of accommodating the extra pre-school children and their equipment. The extent of the principal's and the early education class teacher's knowledge and experience of early childhood education were also rated high among difficulties.

Table 6.1: Administrative Difficulties with Early Education Class Schools

Aspects of the early education class	Perceived difficulty			
	Great Difficulty	Moderate Difficulty	Slight Difficulty	No Difficulty
	%	%	%	%
Finding storage space for equipment	63	24	11	2
Extent of principal's knowledge and experience in early childhood education	17	33	44	6
Providing indoor facilities	22	35	35	8
Arranging accommodation for the extra children	13	26	36	25
Extent of teaching experience on the part of the EEC teachers	11	30	33	26
Encouraging parental support	13	19	36	32
Timetabling	2	17	49	32
Providing outdoor facilities	13	15	39	33
Assisting the professional development of the EEC teacher	6	21	39	34
Clarifying the areas of responsibility of the principal and the EEC teacher	4	24	36	36
Parental concern about the attainment of their primary school children in the early education class	7	18	38	37
Obtaining sufficient assistance from the specialist support services, e.g. guidance officers, speech therapists	19	21	22	38
Noise level	9	28	24	39
Determining priorities for allocation of resources	0	13	47	40
Integrating the pre-school aims with those of the school as a whole	2	13	38	47
Encouraging parent volunteers to work in the early education class	11	19	22	48
Obtaining sufficient professional advice from the advisory teachers	4	4	36	56
Co-ordinating the progression from pre-school through to the primary school	0	7	36	57
Selecting the teacher aide for the early education class	2	15	23	60
Allocating the teaching loads among the staff	4	11	25	60
Maintaining or increasing the morale of the staff	4	18	15	63
Seeking funds for additional facilities from the P & C organisation	2	2	31	65

Table 6.2: Principal's Involvement with the Early Education Class

How often have you:	Often %	Sometimes %	Never %
observed the EEC at your school in operation	62	38	0
taught or supervised in the EEC class at your school	6	77	17
observed EECs at other schools	2	30	68
observed a regular pre-school centre in operation	2	30	68
discussed problems with principals of other EEC schools	34	49	17
discussed problems with advisory and support services personnel	30	68	2
discussed the use of the human and physical resources of the school with the EEC teacher	68	28	4
discussed the work program with the EEC teachers	51	45	4
supervised lesson preparation for the early education class	8	62	30
discussed the respective roles of principal and teacher with the EEC teacher	21	75	4
assisted the EEC teacher in implementing the primary school curricula	51	45	4
discussed the philosophy and practices of pre-school education with the EEC teacher	32	60	8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report is an evaluation of a pilot form of pre-school education in Queensland. In this experimental Project, pre-school children were enrolled at small primary schools and were integrated into the lower primary school class at the school to form an early education class. In 1977, 56 primary schools were involved in the pilot Project.

The sample for the evaluation consisted of all 56 of the pilot schools, plus an equal number of regular primary schools and pre-schools. Questionnaires were sent in 1977 to the principal of each of the primary schools and to the teacher in the lowest class at the school, and in 1978 to the teacher of the next highest class in the school. Also in 1977, questionnaires were sent to a teacher at each of the regular pre-schools. In this way it was hoped to be able to compare children in early education classes (EECs), with their age-peers in regular primary (PR) schools, and in pre-schools (PS). This was done not only from the perspective of the teacher of the children, but also of the teacher of the class into which the children graduated (the 1978 teachers), and of the principals of the primary schools. Responses to the 1977 questionnaires were received from 46 early education class teachers, 36 primary school teachers and 36 pre-school teachers. Responses were also received from 47 early education class principals and 37 primary school principals. In 1978, 40 teachers at early education class schools and 23 teachers at primary schools returned questionnaires.

Information about the enrolments, staffing and class organisation in all schools indicated some differences between early education class schools and primary schools in the pattern of class organisation, though not in the number of pupils or staff at the schools. The tendency was for the lowest class at the school to contain a smaller number of year levels in early education class schools than in primary schools, typically pre-school and Year 1 as opposed to Years 1, 2 and 3. Primary schools also exhibited a greater variety of patterns of class allocation than did early education class schools. Attendance patterns for the pre-schoolers also differed between early education class schools and pre-schools. The most common pattern in early education class schools was for the pre-schoolers to attend all day for two or three days per week, whereas in traditional pre-schools it was more common for them to attend for five half-days.

Since teachers were not randomly allocated to the three types of schools involved in this evaluation, it was expected that there would be some differences in the characteristics of the teachers at the different types of schools. This expectation proved true. Among the 1977 teachers, there were two major differences in background. Early education class and pre-school teachers were generally considerably younger than were primary teachers and had much less teaching experience. In interpreting differences among the teacher types in say, teaching style, it must be remembered that these differences among early education class and pre-school teachers and primary teachers may perhaps be a consequence of background differences.

Virtually all primary teachers received their training in primary teaching, while about half of the pre-school teachers were pre-school trained only and half had both primary and pre-school training. The majority (59 per cent) of early education class teachers had done a combined course but one-quarter were primary trained only and 17 per cent pre-school trained only. Female teachers made up 95 per cent of the 1977 sample. There were no differences in sex composition among the teacher types in 1977.

There were no significant differences between the principals of early education class and primary schools. All but one were male, all but one were trained in primary teaching only (one had done a combined/pre-school course) and none had any formal qualifications in early childhood education. The average total teaching experience was 15.4 years, of which most had been spent with the middle and upper primary years. None had any teaching experience with pre-school or early education classes.

The 1978 teachers in primary and early education class schools showed differences in sex composition, age, and teaching experience, though not in training. Virtually all were trained only in primary teaching. The 1978 teachers at primary schools had twice the total teaching experience of teachers in early education class schools. The 1978 teachers were older and had more teaching experience than the 1977 teachers, reflecting a tendency for lower classes to be allocated to the least experienced teachers. In early education class schools, 72 per cent of the 1978 teachers were female, but in primary schools only 35 per cent were. In addition, there was a higher proportion of males in the 1978 sample than in the 1977 sample, indicating that older classes are more often assigned to male teachers.

The three types of teachers rarely differed in their responses to statements about their work program. However, when differences did occur, it was evident that the early education class teachers were practising a more progressive teaching style with the primary school children than were primary teachers. The early education class children were freer to move about the room and to choose their activities, and the activities of the different year levels were integrated more often. This was due perhaps either to the pre-school training of many of the early education class teachers, or to the simple presence of the pre-schoolers in the classroom, since the pre-schoolers were treated in a more progressive manner than were the primary school children. However, the early education class teachers did not differ from pre-school teachers in progressiveness with pre-school children. The early education classroom seems to change the schooling experience for the primary school children but not for the pre-school children.

The teachers reported that, compared to primary school children, their approach to the pre-schoolers is more child-centred, more individualised, more activity-based, less routinised, more flexible, involves more integration of subject matter, more child choice of activities, more freedom of movement for the children, less orientation to the acquisition of specific knowledge, and more attention to the process of acquiring knowledge. There are major differences between how the early education class teacher treats the pre-school children and how she treats the primary school children. Although the pre-school and primary school approaches to education have interacted in the early education class, they are still quite distinct and no new approach, fuelled by the new situation, appears to have yet emerged.

Although the teachers exhibited these differences in teaching style, the approach to pre-schoolers was not any less planned than that for primary school children. This is so despite early education class teachers tending to concentrate on the primary school children, and the teacher aides and parent volunteers concentrating on the lower Years in the class.

Possibly because the teachers tended more frequently to discuss the primary school work program than the pre-school work program with the principal, the pre-school objectives were slightly less well integrated with the objectives of the school as a whole than were the lower primary school objectives. This result is probably partly due to the low level of pre-school training and experience of the principals, and to the greatly different approaches to education found in the pre-school and primary school traditions. There is a clear need for in-service courses for principals which would go some way to increasing the co-ordination of pre-school and primary school objectives.

The major section of the questionnaires sent to the respondents consisted of a list of 43 educational aims grouped into 10 general categories: social and emotional aims, general cognitive, physical, language, mathematics, social studies, art, music, science, and community aims. For example, a social and emotional aim was the development of a positive attitude to school and schooling among the students, and for the language area, the development of reading and pre-reading skills. All respondents were asked to rate, on a four point scale, the degree of importance they attached to each of the educational aims. In addition, the 1977 teachers rated their success in achieving these aims with each year level in their class. The principals also rated the success of the 1977 teachers for teacher year level. The 1978 teachers rated the 1977 teachers' success for the year level which had just passed into the 1978 teacher's class from the 1977 teachers' class. In this way, it was hoped to gauge the emphasis given to the various components of the school curriculum by those involved, and also to discover how successful the early education class teachers believed they were compared to primary and pre-school teachers.

There were relatively few aims for which importance ratings were significantly different among teacher or principal types. There were no differences between the 1978 teacher types and only four between early education class principals and primary principals. Early education class teachers and pre-school teachers rated only one aim differently for the pre-schoolers, but early education class and primary teachers showed significant differences in importance ratings for 10 aims at the Year 1 level. These differences indicate that the early education class teachers were extending the pre-school orientation of stressing social and emotional development, and the development of aesthetic skills in music and art to the Year 1 children. The early education class teachers also tended to introduce earlier the primary school emphasis on cognitive skills, so that the Year 1 children in early education classrooms were treated more like Year 2 children in some cognitive areas, than were comparable children in primary classrooms. Thus, the pre-school and primary school approaches to education tend to meet at the Year 1 level in early education classrooms, with traditional pre-school curricular emphasis being extended to Year 1, and traditional primary school emphasis being introduced earlier to the primary school children. That is, the presence of pre-schoolers tends to change the curriculum for primary school children, but the presence of the primary school children does not seem to significantly change the curriculum for the pre-schoolers.

The 1977 and 1978 teachers and the principals were in fairly close agreement about which aims are the most and least important at the various year levels, although the principals tended to downgrade the importance of the pre-school year compared with the 1977 teachers. This is hardly surprising in view of the minimal level of pre-school training and experience among the principals.

Generally the 1977 teachers and the principals agreed on which aims the teachers had been most and least successful in achieving. The 1978 teachers, however, appeared to feel that the 1977 teachers had been somewhat less successful than the 1977 teachers felt themselves to be, except in the area of parental involvement.

Early education class teachers in 1977 rated themselves more successful than did primary teachers in many areas at both Year 1 and 2 levels. That no significant differences occurred for the pre-school children reinforces the interpretation that the early education class changes the classroom experience for primary school children but not for pre-school children. The greatest differences were in the general cognitive area, followed by the art, physical and language areas. Early education class principals also felt their teachers had been more successful than did the primary principals, although in a smaller number of aims. There were no differences in success ratings between teachers of the next highest class in early education class schools and primary schools. Although one could assume that these significant differences reflect actual differences in the degree of success with which certain aims were achieved in the lowest class of early education class schools and primary schools, due perhaps to the differences in teaching style found in these classes, it seems likely that some of the differences are artificial. Both the Hawthorne effect, and the effect of differing adaptation levels could account for some significant differences. However, it seems clear that the pilot early education class scheme is not retarding the achievement of the students, and may indeed be of benefit to them. Certainly, all the early education class respondent groups felt that the pilot project was of benefit to the children. This was determined by presenting these respondents with several general statements about the effects of the early education class scheme on both the pre-schoolers and the lower primary children, and asking whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements. The early education class teachers were most enthusiastically approving of the scheme and the principals only slightly less so. A significant minority of teachers of the class above the early education class felt that the scheme may have been adversely affecting the achievement of the primary children. However, the great majority of all staff had favourable opinions of the scheme.

Since pilot projects, such as the early education class scheme, often involve lack of co-ordination, training, and resources in the early stages of implementation, it was expected that a number of aspects of the early education class situation would act to hinder the attainment of educational aims. In order to discover whether this was so, the 1977 teachers were asked to rate the degree to which a number of factors hindered their attainment of educational aims. Only four factors were rated significantly differently by the three teacher types: knowledge and experience in an early education class (more of a hindrance for early education class teachers); amount of space for indoor activities (less of a hindrance for pre-school teachers); number of hours the aide is in attendance (a hindrance for very few early education class teachers, more pre-school and many more primary teachers); and amount of noise transmitted to other classrooms (less of a hindrance for pre-school teachers). All other factors were rated similarly by all teachers.

Thus, there seem to be few aspects of the early education class situation which particularly hinder attainment compared to primary schools or pre-schools. However, one hindrance does stand out: 28 per cent of early education class teachers felt that their lack of knowledge and experience in teaching in an early education class was a great hindrance to them. This is not surprising since many of the teachers assigned to early education classes are recent graduates with little experience in either multi-year classrooms or early education classes. There is a clear need for in-service courses or regional workshops for early education class teachers to prepare them for the early education classroom.

A variety of support services are provided for teachers. Advisory teacher visits, regional meetings of school personnel, in-service courses and departmental publications are examples of such support services. In order to gauge the impact of support services on early education class schools and on regular schools, the 1977 teachers were asked to rate the degree of assistance provided by, and the level of assistance preferred for, various types of support services and in various areas of teaching.

There were few significant differences in ratings among teacher types, but where these did occur it was the primary teachers who reported receiving the lowest level of support. It appears that a greater degree of support is provided to teachers of pre-school children than to primary school teachers.

The types of support services rated most helpful were the early education class induction seminar, pre-school advisory teacher visits, visits by special support personnel, and regional meetings of Class 4 schools personnel. These support services appear to have in common that they are geared to giving concrete assistance in fairly specific areas rather than providing more general support.

The services rated least valuable and rarely provided were in-service workshops, school-based in-service programs, and the publications Resources Review and Curriculum Papers which rarely focus on the lower primary school and never on the pre-school. *Links*, which is aimed at teachers of pre-school children only, was regarded as very helpful by most of the teachers who received it.

In only two content areas did a majority of teachers feel that they had received moderate or great assistance from support services: using adult supports such as aides and parents, and working with an early education class. In all other areas the great majority had received little or no support. The areas on which teachers placed highest priority for further assistance were catering for children with specific difficulties, catering for individual differences, and working with an early education class.

Notable features of all teachers' ratings of support provided were that a relatively high proportion claimed to have received no assistance from several sources and in many content areas, and that virtually all teachers would have liked a higher level of support than they had received. There was some evidence that the perceived low level of assistance provided by some support services was due to differences of opinion between classroom teachers and support personnel on the content of the service. For example, the departmental publication *Links* appears to cater much more to the interests and needs of pre-school and lower primary school teachers than does a publication such as Resources Review which is little read and apparently of little assistance to teachers. Other support services were rated of low assistance probably because of the low level of resources allocated to that support service. For example, 39 per cent of teachers saw pre-school advisory teachers visits as of great assistance, while only 15 per cent thought the same of primary advisory teacher visits. Doubtless, some of this difference is due to the fact that there were over five times as many pre-school advisory teachers to each pre-school teacher as there were primary school advisory teachers to each primary school teacher. Another reason could be that pre-school advisory teachers make regular uninvited visits, in addition to invited visits, while primary advisory teachers visit only by invitation from the teachers.

In pre-schools, a teacher aide works full-time with each teacher, while in regular Class 4 primary schools one or more teacher aides works only 15 hours per week and serves the entire school. The early education class schools fall between these two school types in allocation of aides: in addition to the regular primary school allocation of teacher aide time, a further 15 hours is allocated for the early education class. Some questions were directed at the teachers in order to discover how these differences in aide allocation have altered the role of the aide.

Significant differences among teacher types were found in the degree of responsibility conferred on the teacher aide. Fewer primary teachers than pre-school and early education class teachers reported that the aide was involved in program planning or execution, or that the aide sometimes initiated activities with the children. These differences were attributed to the closer working relationship of the pre-school and early education class teachers and their aides. Both these groups of teachers theoretically have the services of an aide full-time while the pre-schoolers are present, whereas primary teachers have to share an aide with the other classes in the school.

It was expected that the aide's duties would be different among school types, but this was not found to be the case. Nor were there any differences in the activities of parent volunteers among school types. When the roles of the teacher aide and the parent volunteer were contrasted it became apparent that parents were used more often for supervisory duties and aides more often for material preparation and clerical and domestic duties. Parental involvement was reported to be very low by primary teachers, quite high by pre-school teachers, and early education class teachers fell between the two. It was shown that parental involvement parallelled the number of pre-school children in each type of classroom.

The principals of the early education class schools were, naturally, less involved in the day-to-day routine of the early education classroom than were the teachers and aides, and were, through their relative inexperience with early childhood education, less able to participate if called upon to do so. The principals were asked about their relationship to the early education class: the degree of their involvement with the class, and any aspects of the administration of the class which had caused them difficulties. It appears that most principals discussed the early education class with its teacher and observed it in operation fairly often, although few reported being more actively involved in teaching or supervising the class, or supervising lesson preparation for it. Few had observed other early education classes in operation, although about one-third claimed to often discuss problems related to the class with other early education class principals and advisory personnel.

As might be expected, the greatest administrative problems for the early education class principals were those caused by the experimental status of the Project. Thus, the greatest administrative problems were caused by the physical difficulties of accommodating the extra pre-school children and their equipment. In addition, the extent of the principal's and the early education class teacher's knowledge and experience of early childhood education were rated high among difficulties.

The Early Education Class Project appears to be working well, and to have beneficial effects on the children. The working is not entirely smooth, but the problems that do exist seem largely of a 'running-in' kind. Those involved with the Project are enthusiastic about the innovation and are confident that it entails significant benefits for the children. There appears to have been no substantial success in integrating pre-school and primary school approaches to education in the early education classroom. There is much more to be done, therefore, to create a coherent approach to early childhood education in Queensland schools.

APPENDIX 1

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

THE SCHOOL

Information was collected from all respondents on the school in which they taught. The information sought dealt largely with the enrolments, staffing and class organisation of the school. Table A1.1 shows the enrolments for each year level for the three types of schools. The typical pre-school in the sample had 46.0 children enrolled, while the early education class (EEC) schools had 62.9 and primary (PR) schools had 61.9. There were no significant differences between EEC and PR schools in enrolment in any of the primary school Years, or in total enrolment. There was naturally a significant difference in pre-school enrolment. EEC schools had 9.4 pre-schoolers enrolled, while PR schools had none.

EEC schools and PR schools did not have a significantly different number of teaching staff, excluding aides. The average number of teachers was 3.0 at each school. The allocation of classes to teachers differed, however, across school types.

In schools with an early education class the two most common patterns of class allocation were as follows:

Teacher one : pre-school and Year 1
Teacher two : Years 2 and 3
Teacher three : Years 4 and 5
Teacher four : Years 6 and 7

or:

Teacher one ; pre-school and Year 1
Teacher two : Years 2, 3 and 4
Teacher three : Years 5, 6 and 7

Each of these patterns occurred in about one-third of EEC schools in the survey. There were eight other patterns of class allocation which occurred in from one to four schools.

In schools without an early education class there was a wide range of class allocation patterns, 13 of which occurred in only one or two schools. The most common pattern, which occurred in 41 per cent of PR schools, was:

Teacher one : Years 1, 2 and 3
Teacher two : Years 4, 5, 6 and 7

In 22 per cent of schools the pattern was:

Teacher one : Years 1 and 2

Teacher two : Years 3 and 4

Teacher three : Years 5, 6 and 7

There are two main ways in which the EEC and PR schools were different. Both the lowest and the second lowest classes in the PR school tended to be composed of more year levels than those in EEC schools; and there were more patterns of class allocation in PR schools than in EEC schools.

Although the allocation of year levels to classes differed between EEC and PR schools, the class enrolments were not significantly different in the lowest class in the school: 22.6 children were enrolled in EEC classes, and 22.2 were in PR classes. Table A1.2 gives the enrolment details and shows that the number of children at each year level in the two types of school differed. In the same way, Table A1.3 gives the enrolment pattern for the class above the lowest class of the school. This is the class that, in the case of EEC schools, receives the children who graduate from the EEC class. Again, the total enrolment for EEC and PR schools did not differ significantly, but the number of children at each year level in the class did differ. For both the lowest and the second lowest class at the school, the differences in the pattern of enrolments is the same: EEC classes tended to have more children in the lower year levels while PR classes tended to have more in the upper year levels. This pattern of enrolments reflects the allocation of year levels to classes discussed above.

The attendance patterns of pre-schoolers in traditional pre-schools were compared with those in primary schools incorporating early education classes. The results of the comparison are given in Table A1.4. In the bulk of EEC classes, the pre-school children attended either all day for two or three days per week (44 per cent), or for five half-days per week (39 per cent). Children in traditional pre-schools rarely attended all day: in 57 per cent of pre-schools, the children attend for five half-days per week. A significant minority of pre-schools (34 per cent) offered a combination, with some children attending five half-days and some for full days.

THE 1977 TEACHERS

The sample of teachers for the 1977 questionnaire was composed of 36 pre-school (PS) teachers, 46 teachers of early education (EEC) classes, and 36 teachers in traditional Class 4 primary (PR) schools. The 1977 questionnaire sought a variety of biographical information from these teachers.

A total of 95 per cent of the teachers were female and 5 per cent male. There were no significant differences in sex composition among the groups of teachers.

Table A1.5 gives the age distribution of the teachers. It is evident that the age distributions of pre-school and early education class teachers were highly similar, but dissimilar from the primary teachers. The difference is due to the substantially greater proportion of PR teachers over 25 years old. Sixty-one per cent of PR teachers were older than 25 years, while only 19 per cent of PS teachers and 20 per cent of EEC teachers were in that age range.

Table A1.6 shows the pre-service qualifications of the teachers. As might be expected, the great majority (92 per cent) of PR school teachers had teachers college primary school training, while only 8 per cent of PS teachers had this training. As a group with both pre-school and primary children in their classes, the EEC teachers fell between these two figures: 24 per cent of EEC teachers were trained as primary school teachers in teachers colleges. Again, as expected, none of the PR teachers were trained at the Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College, while 17 per cent of the EEC teachers and 53 per cent of the PS teachers gained their pre-service qualifications there. There are also differences among the teachers on the third type of pre-service training, a combined pre-school and primary course at a teachers college. This combined course has only existed in Queensland for the last decade. Thus, teachers who took their pre-service education in the 1960s or earlier would not have had the opportunity to do the combined course. Since, as Table A1.5 shows, the PR teachers tend to be older than the other types of teachers in this study, this may partly explain the fact that no PR teacher took the combined pre-school and primary course, while 59 per cent of EEC teachers and 39 per cent of PS teachers did. Part of the difference may also be accounted for by the greatly expanded provision of pre-school places in the 1970s, since teachers with combined primary and pre-school training, in this decade, tended to be allocated to pre-schools rather than to primary schools.

The qualifications of the teachers, beyond their pre-service training, are shown in Table A1.7. Very few of the teachers had completed or were completing additional qualifications and there were no significant differences among teacher types on these variables.

Table A1.8 revels the teaching experience of the sample of teachers. The first point to note is that on most types of teaching experience, the categories of teachers differed significantly. Only on the extent of experience in teaching in secondary schools and special classes, where the teachers had negligible teaching experience, did the groups not differ significantly. As expected, the PS teachers had more experience in pre-school teaching, and the PR teachers had more in traditional primary school teaching. The most important difference to note is that in total teaching experience. The PR teachers averaged 7.5 years teaching experience, while EEC and PS teachers had 2.8 and 2.2 years teaching experience respectively. These differences in teaching experience reflect the differences in age shown in Table A1.5. Thus, the PS and EEC teacher samples are comparable in terms of age and teaching experience, but different from the PR teacher samples. Thus, any other differences that occur in this study between PR teachers on the one hand, and PS or EEC teachers on the other, may simply be due to differences in extent of teaching experience or in age.

In-service courses on early childhood education are provided for interested teachers. In order to gauge the penetration of these courses, the teachers were asked how many such courses they had attended and how many days they had spent at the courses. Tables A1.9 and A1.10 give the responses to the questions. Over half of the EEC teachers had attended one or more in-service courses in early childhood education. Only 21 per cent of PS teachers and 11 per cent of PR teachers had attended such a course. The average EEC teacher had spent only 3.8 days in in-service early childhood education courses, while the attendance figures for PS and PR teachers were minuscule.

THE 1977 TEACHER AIDES

The three types of schools in this survey differ in the extent to which teacher aides are used. Typical Class 4 schools without pre-school enrolments have one or more aides working for 15 hours per week. Schools participating in the early education class project have been provided with the services of an additional 15 hours per week of teacher aide time, specifically to assist the teacher of the early education class. Pre-school units have one full-time aide employed for each teacher.

In the 1977 questionnaire, information was sought from teachers on the deployment of the aide's services in their class. Some biographical information on the aide was also requested. Teachers of EEC classes were asked to refer in their answers only to the aide working in their class.

All aides in the survey were female. From Table A1.11, it may be seen that a higher proportion of aides in EEC classes are under 30 years (61 per cent) compared with those employed in either pre-schools (39 per cent) or typical Class 4 schools (11 per cent).

Table A1.12 shows that a significantly higher proportion of pre-school aides had undertaken training as an aide. Fifty per cent of PS aides had completed, or were currently undertaking, a teacher aide course at the Kangaroo Point Technical College. Only 11 per cent of EEC aides and 3 per cent of PR aides had taken this course. However, differences in training between the aides at the different types of school were not significant in any other area. Few of the aides had any teacher training: 95 per cent had not completed any teacher training course and 71 per cent had no teaching experience with young children. Nor was there any significant difference in experience of supervising young children. Seventy-three per cent of aides had one year or more experience of supervising.

As would be expected from the allocation of aides to the different types of schools, pre-school and early education class teachers reported having an aide in attendance for a greater number of hours per week than did primary school teachers: 30 as opposed to 15 hours (Table A1.13). The teachers reported that, in addition, the aides worked an average of 3.3 hours per week in unpaid overtime. There was no significant difference among school types on this variable.

THE 1977 PRINCIPALS

The sample of principals was composed of 47 principals from Class 4 primary schools with an EEC class, and 37 principals of Class 4 schools without an EEC class. There were no significant differences in biographical details between the two types of principal, so only the combined figures will be presented here.

Table A1.14 shows the age distribution of the principals. The majority of the principals were less than 40 years old. All but one of the principals was male and all but one had completed their pre-service training at a teachers college in primary school teaching. One EEC principal had done a combined pre-school and primary teaching course at a teachers college.

Table A1.15 shows the additional education that the principals had undertaken since their pre-service training. One-third of the principals had completed, or were currently undertaking a Bachelor of Educational Studies, or its equivalent. Ten per cent had completed or were undertaking other university pass degrees and another 12 per cent diploma upgrading courses. None of the principals claimed to have any formal qualifications in early childhood education or to have completed a higher degree.

The principals had spent an average of 2.9 years at their present school, and had been principals for 12.4 years. EEC principals had been principal of a school with an EEC class for 1.2 years. This figure compares with the 1.3 years that the school, on the average, had an EEC class. The teaching experience of the principals is given in Table A1.16. There were no significant differences between the types of principal in the years of teaching experience of any type. The average teaching experience was 15.4 years, of which 13.0 years had been spent in multi-year classrooms. The majority appear to have spent most of their time with the middle and upper primary years (12.9 years, as against 5.5 years with Years 1 and 2) and none had any pre-school experience. Teaching experience with EEC classes, secondary and special classes was negligible.

Principals were asked how many in-service courses, excluding regional seminars, on early childhood education they had attended. EEC and PR principals responded significantly differently ($\chi^2 = 22.7$, df = 3, $p < .0001$). Of the EEC principals, 38 per cent reported attending none (89 per cent for PR principals), 55 per cent reported one, 4 per cent two and 2 per cent three or more. Thus, only 62 per cent of EEC principals had attended any in-service courses on early childhood education. Eleven per cent of PR principals reported attending one course, but none had attended more.

The principals were also asked the total duration, in days, of the early childhood education in-service courses they had attended. The answers to this question were also significantly different. The mean number of days spent by EEC principals at early childhood education courses was 2.3, and by PR principals 0.3 ($F = 16.9$, df = 1, 82, $p < 0.0001$). This difference is accounted for by the high proportion of PR principals who reported spending no days at in-service courses. It is unlikely that the actual duration of courses was less for those PR principals who did attend courses, than for the EEC principals who attended.

THE 1978 TEACHERS

The 1978 questionnaire was completed by teachers of the class above the lowest class in Class 4 schools. In schools with an early education class this meant the class above the EEC class. The teacher of this class would have received, at the beginning of 1978, children who had spent 1977 in the EEC class. The sample of teachers consisted of 40 teachers from Class 4 schools with an EEC class and 23 teachers from regular Class 4 primary schools. The biographical information sought from the 1978 teachers was essentially the same as that obtained from the 1977 teachers.

For the 1978 teachers, there were significant differences in the sex composition of the sample. In EEC schools, 28 per cent of teachers were male and 72 per cent female, while in PR schools, 65 per cent were male and 35 per cent female ($\chi^2 = 7.1$, df = 1, $p < .01$). That is, female teachers formed twice the proportion in the EEC schools that they did in the PR schools. There is a substantially greater proportion of males in the 1978 sample than in the 1977 sample, presumably reflecting the tendency of principals to allocate male teachers to classes with older children.

Table A1.17 shows the age distribution of teachers in the sample. The differences in age between the two teacher types was marginally significant. Two-thirds of the EEC teachers were less than 31 years old, while only one-third of the PR teachers were in this age range. Thus, the EEC teachers were younger than the PR teachers in both 1977 and 1978. The 1977 teachers were, however, slightly younger than the 1978 teachers.

Table A1.18 gives the pre-service qualifications of the teachers. There were no significant differences between teacher types. The great majority (95 per cent) received their training in primary teaching at a teachers college. Only one teacher had done a combined primary and pre-school course at a teachers college and one had a university degree plus diploma. Table A1.19 shows that a small percentage of teachers in the sample had some additional qualifications (excluding in-service training). Sixteen per cent were undertaking a Bachelor of Educational Studies Degree or equivalent, and 8 per cent were undertaking diploma upgrading courses. Very few teachers had completed such courses. Slightly more 1978 teachers had completed or were completing additional qualifications than was the case for the 1977 teachers. The one exception to this was the conversion course to pre-school teaching. More of the 1977 teachers had completed this course and were teaching pre-school children.

Teaching experience is given in Table A1.20. Teaching experience in pre-school, early education classes, secondary and special classes was negligible for both EEC and PR teachers. Both types of teacher had about four years experience of teaching Years 1 and 2, but experience of teaching middle and upper primary Years, total teaching experience and experience in multi-year classrooms were significantly different for the two teacher types. In each case, PR teachers had about twice as much experience as EEC teachers. EEC teachers had 6.3 years total teaching experience and PR teachers, 12.6 years. When the teaching experience of the 1977 sample is compared with that of the 1978 sample, it is clear that the 1978 teachers had about twice the teaching experience of their 1977 colleagues. Apparently inexperienced teachers are more likely to be given the lower classes in a school. The difference was greatest for teachers in EEC schools, reflecting the tendency for teachers of EEC classes to be young, inexperienced, recent graduates.

Table A1.1: Number of Children Enrolled in Each Year Level

Year level	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
Pre-school	46.0	9.4	0.0
1		9.6	10.8
2		7.8	9.5
3		7.1	9.4
4		7.5	7.9
5		6.9	8.2
6		7.7	8.4
7		6.9	7.7
Total	46.0	62.9	61.9

Table A1.2: Number of Children Enrolled in the Lowest Class in the School

Year level	School type	
	Early Education Class	Primary
Pre-school	10.3	0.0
Year 1	9.2	11.1
Year 2	2.4	7.4
Year 3	0.7	3.7
Total	22.6	22.2

Note: Differences among the groups at each year level were all statistically significant at the .0001 level.

The information in this table was supplied by the 1977 teachers. It differs slightly from that supplied by the principals and shown in Table A1.1

Table A1.3: Number of Children Enrolled in the Class Above the Lowest Class in the School

Year level	School type		
	Early Education Class	Primary	Significance level
Year 1	0.3	0.0	N.S.
Year 2	8.2	1.3	.0001
Year 3	8.1	3.6	.001
Year 4	4.2	8.1	.001
Year 5	0.6	2.9	.001
Year 6	0.7	3.6	.0001
Year 7	0.6	3.1	.0001
Total	22.7	22.6	N.S.

N.S. = not significant

Table A1.4: Attendance Pattern of Pre-school children

Attendance of pre-schoolers	School type	
	Pre-school %	Early Education Class %
All day, 5 days a week	6	0
All day, 2–3 days a week	3	44
Mornings, 5 days a week	0	17
Afternoons, 5 days a week	0	22
Some children attend 5 mornings and some 5 afternoons a week	57	11
Some children attend all day 5 days a week, some 5 mornings, and some 5 afternoons.	34	0
Other	0	6

$\chi^2 = 60.8$, df = 6, $p < .0001$

Table A1.5: Age Distribution of 1977 Teachers

Age	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Under 20 years	3	0	0
20 – 25 years	78	80	39
26 – 30 years	8	9	3
31 – 40 years	8	9	28
41 – 50 years	3	2	22
51 – 65 years	0	0	0

$\chi^2 = 34.4$, df = 10, $p < .001$

Table A1.6: Pre-Service Qualifications of 1977 Teachers

Pre-service training	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Teachers College: Primary	8	24	92
Teachers College: Combined Primary and Pre-school	39	59	0
Kindergarten Teachers College	53	17	0
Other	0	0	8

$\chi^2 = 86.2$, df = 6, $p < .0001$

Table A1.7: Additional Qualifications of 1977 Teachers

Qualification	Completed %	In process of completion %
Bachelor of Educational Studies Degree (or equivalent)	0	7
University pass degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc.)	0	2
Diploma upgrading course	1	3
Pre-school extension course for primary and secondary teachers	5	0
Other	4	0

Table A1.8: Teaching Experience of 1977 Teachers

Teaching experience	Years of teaching			Significance Level
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary	
Pre-school	2.7	0.6	0.0	.0001
Early Education Class	0.0	1.2	0.1	.0001
Lower primary years (Years 1 and 2)	0.4	1.1	7.1	.0001
Middle and upper primary years (Years 3–7)	0.4	0.5	2.8	.0001
Secondary	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.S.
Special	0.0	0.1	0.1	N.S.
Total years in multi-year classrooms	0.3	1.3	5.1	.0001
Total years teaching	2.2	2.8	7.5	.0001

N.S. = not significant

Table A1.9: Attendance at In-Service Courses on Early Childhood Education by 1977 Teachers

Number of early childhood education courses attended	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
None	79	41	89
One	18	31	8
Two	0	15	3
Three or more	3	13	0

$\chi^2 = 27.3$, df = 6, $p < .001$

Table A1.10: Duration of Attendance at In-Service Courses on Early Childhood Education by 1977 Teachers

	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
Duration of course in days	0.4	3.8	0.3

F = 21.5, df = 2, $p < .0001$

Table A1.11: Age Distribution of Aides

Age	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Under 30 years	39	61	11
30 – 45 years	58	35	83
Over 45 years	3	4	6

$\chi^2 = 21.6$, df = 4, $p < .001$

Table A1.12: Qualifications of Aides

Training	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Completed teacher aide course	33	4	0
Currently undertaking teacher aide course	17	7	3
No teacher aide training	50	89	97

$\chi^2 = 30.8$, df = 4, $p < .0001$

Table A1.13: Time for Which Aide is Employed

Hours per week aide is employed	School type		
	Pre-school	Early Education Class	Primary
	%	%	%
Under 15 hours	0	0	3
15 – 19 hours	11	13	80
20 – 24 hours	3	2	6
25 – 30 hours	53	78	11
Over 30 hours	33	7	0

$\chi^2 = 74.7$, df = 8, $p < .0001$

Table A1.14: Age Distribution of Principals

	Age in years			
	26 – 30	31 – 40	41 – 50	51 – 65
Percentage of principals	26	50	14	10

Table A1.15: Educational Qualifications of Principals Beyond Pre-Service Training

Qualification	Percentage of principals	
	In process of completing qualification	Completed qualification
	%	%
Bachelor of Educational Studies (or equivalent)	24	10
University pass degree	4	6
Diploma upgrading course	10	2
Other	1	5

Table A1.16: Teaching Experience of Principals

Teaching experience	Years of teaching
Pre-school	0.0
Early Education Class	0.2
Lower primary Years (Years 1 and 2)	5.5
Middle and upper primary Years (Years 3–7)	12.9
Secondary	0.1
Special	0.0
Total years in multi-year classrooms	13.0
Total years teaching	15.4

Table A1.17: Age Distribution of 1978 Teachers

Age	Teachers
	%
Under 20 years	0
20 – 25 years	30
26 – 30 years	26
31 – 40 years	27
41 – 50 years	11
51 – 65 years	6

Table A1.18: Pre-Service Qualifications of 1978 Teachers

Pre-service training	Teachers
	%
Teachers College: primary	95
Teachers College: combined primary and pre-school	2
University degree plus primary diploma	2
Other	1

Table A1.19: Additional Qualifications of 1978 Teachers

Qualification	Completed %	In process of completion %
Bachelor of Educational Studies (or equivalent)	2	16
University pass degree (e.g. B.A., B.S.c.)	3	2
Diploma upgrading course	2	8
Other	6	0

Table A1.20: Teaching Experience of 1978 Teachers

Teaching experience	Years of teaching		Significance level
	Early Education Class	Primary	
Pre-school	0.0	0.0	N.S.
Early Education Class	0.0	0.0	N.S.
Lower primary Years (Years 1 and 2)	3.5	3.9	N.S.
Middle and upper primary Years (Years 3–7)	3.6	8.7	.001
Secondary	0.1	0.0	N.S.
Special	0.1	0.1	N.S.
Total years in multi-year classrooms	4.2	9.5	.01
Total years teaching	6.3	12.6	.01

N.S. = not significant

APPENDIX 2

IMPORTANCE AND SUCCESS RATINGS
OF EDUCATIONAL AIMS

Table A2.1: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Social and Emotional Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successf %
Emotional control and maturity	Pre-school	0	0	14	86	0	4	80	16
	Year One	0	9	26	65	0	6	58	36
	Year Two	2	19	34	46	0	4	59	37
A positive self-image	Pre-school	0	0	3	97	0	5	54	41
	Year One	0	2	18	80	0	9	54	37
	Year Two	0	7	30	63	0	6	61	33
A positive attitude to school and schooling	Pre-school	1	5	28	66	0	3	51	46
	Year One	0	1	17	82	0	3	51	46
	Year Two	0	4	21	75	0	2	59	39
Personal responsibility	Pre-school	0	2	28	70	0	11	53	36
	Year One	0	11	35	54	0	18	58	24
	Year Two	0	4	32	64	0	13	70	17
Social skills	Pre-school	0	0	12	88	0	10	62	28
	Year One	0	1	21	78	*	*	*	*
	Year Two	0	6	15	79	0	11	64	25
A moral code	Pre-school	0	0	20	80	0	12	71	17
	Year One	0	1	11	88	0	10	65	25
	Year Two	0	2	15	83	0	9	70	21

Note: In Tables A2.1-A2.20 –

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.2: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: General Cognitive Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successf %
Memory	Pre-school	0	3	50	47	0	7	70	23
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	6	26	68	*	*	*	*
Classification	Pre-school	2	5	45	48	0	12	63	25
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	6	44	50	0	9	64	27
Seriation	Pre-school	1	5	44	50	1	12	62	25
	Year 1	0	5	23	72	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	7	52	41	0	0	67	33
Spatial and temporal relations	Pre-school	1	5	40	54	1	11	56	32
	Year 1	0	1	26	72	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	5	41	54	*	*	*	*
Thinking	Pre-school	0	6	30	64	1	21	65	13
	Year 1	1	6	21	71	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	0	19	81	*	*	*	*
Perception	Pre-school	0	1	21	78	0	6	66	28
	Year 1	0	0	15	85	0	5	69	26
	Year 2	0	4	26	70	*	*	*	*

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.3: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Physical Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM Not important %	 Slightly important %	 Moderately important %	 Highly important %	SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM Not successful %	 Slightly successful %	 Moderately successful %	 Highly successfu %
Fine muscle control	Pre-school	0	0	18	82	0	9	51	40
	Year 1	0	0	15	85	•	•	•	•
	Year 2	0	6	46	48	0	0	40	60
Gross muscle control	Pre-school	0	2	14	84	0	3	43	54
	Year 1	0	9	27	64	•	•	•	•
	Year 2	0	13	43	44	0	2	63	35
Ability to play games	Pre-school	#	#	#	#	0	15	55	30
	Year 1	0	10	45	45	•	•	•	•
	Year 2	0	8	45	47	0	2	68	30
Health skills	Pre-school	0	6	25	69	0	11	63	26
	Year 1	0	1	24	75	0	10	64	26
	Year 2	0	2	13	85	0	7	65	28
Physical fitness	Pre-school	0	25	32	43	0	20	55	25
	Year 1	0	19	38	43	0	16	56	28
	Year 2	0	9	51	40	0	13	54	33

• These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

# This aim was rated significantly differently at the .01 level by 1977 EEC and PS teachers.

Table A2.4: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Language Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successfu
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Reading and pre-reading skills	Pre-school	2	11	43	44	3	14	66	17
	Year 1	0	0	4	96	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	7	17	76	0	2	60	38
Writing and pre-writing skills	Pre-school	1	15	42	42	1	21	56	22
	Year 1	0	0	9	91	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	4	20	76	0	7	58	35
Speaking skills	Pre-school	0	1	15	84	0	11	65	24
	Year 1	0	0	6	94	0	8	55	37
	Year 2	0	0	8	92	0	4	70	26
Listening skills	Pre-school	0	0	5	95	0	11	67	22
	Year 1	0	0	5	95	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	0	11	89	0	13	65	22
Spelling skills	Pre-school	87	13	0	0	73	7	9	11
	Year 1	24	44	12	20	15	26	42	17
	Year 2	0	4	31	65	0	15	61	24

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.5: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Mathematics Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly success
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Number and number operations	Pre-school	67	20	13	0	48	14	29	9
	Year 1	0	5	18	77	0	5	64	31
	Year 2	0	0	9	91	0	7	56	37
Sets and logic	Pre-school	1	26	50	23	5	19	60	16
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	2	13	35	50	0	4	61	35
Measurement and estimation	Pre-school	12	43	39	6	11	35	49	5
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	5	41	54	0	13	65	22

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 ELC and PR teachers.

Table A2.6: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Social Studies Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successfu %
Knowledge of relationships of various groups and individuals within the community	Pre-school	0	15	43	42	0	18	55	27
	Year 1	0	8	41	51	0	9	59	32
	Year 2	2	2	46	50	0	7	70	23
Knowledge of patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	Pre-school	7	38	43	12	5	38	47	10
	Year 1	4	16	48	32	1	22	53	24
	Year 2	0	6	46	48	0	10	67	23
Knowledge of man's relation to his physical environment	Pre-school	13	47	31	9	14	38	40	8
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	6	27	51	16
	Year 2	0	17	57	26	2	21	66	11
Knowledge of various roles of individuals in the community	Pre-school	0	5	57	38	1	7	52	40
	Year 1	0	9	29	62	1	8	53	38
	Year 2	0	6	38	56	0	9	58	33
Knowledge of rules and cultural traditions within a society	Pre-school	6	33	44	17	9	27	50	14
	Year 1	3	16	42	39	3	18	61	18
	Year 2	2	2	52	44	0	12	73	15

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.7: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Art Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Basic art skills	Pre-school	5	12	24	59	2	13	42	43
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	2	13	58	27	*	*	*	*
Appreciation and enjoyment of art	Pre-school	3	7	23	67	4	8	44	44
	Year 1	1	9	30	60	1	16	47	36
	Year 2	0	7	38	55	0	17	49	34
Artistic expression	Pre-school	4	8	29	59	3	4	54	39
	Year 1	4	16	34	46	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	6	17	38	39	*	*	*	*

- * These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.8: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Music aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successfu %
Basic concepts of music	Pre-school	1	0	51	48	1	22	51	26
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	1	18	54	26
	Year 2	*	*	*	*	0	9	59	32
Appreciation and enjoyment [illegible] music	Pre-school	0	4	16	80	0	9	43	48
	Year 1	1	6	27	66	1	14	47	37
	Year 2	0	2	35	63	2	13	54	31
Ability to play instruments	Pre-school	1	17	52	30	3	33	44	20
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	4	19	49	28	11	35	39	15
Singing	Pre-school	0	0	39	61	0	10	47	43
	Year 1	0	2	47	51	1	8	49	42
	Year 2	0	4	47	49	2	4	50	44
Movement and dance	Pre-school	0	1	36	63	0	21	48	31
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	3	18	47	32
	Year 2	2	7	53	38	4	22	46	28

* These aims were rated significantly differently at .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.9: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Science Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successfu %
Knowledge of living things	Pre-school	0	5	36	59	0	9	51	40
	Year 1	0	3	34	63	0	9	50	41
	Year 2	0	0	32	68	0	4	47	49
Knowledge of conversation	Pre-school	0	5	34	61	0	19	46	35
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	0	12	54	34
	Year 2	0	0	31	69	0	8	63	29
Knowledge of the earth in space	Pre-school	12	55	29	4	14	46	35	5
	Year 1	9	37	44	10	5	31	57	7
	Year 2	2	25	52	21	4	27	61	8

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.10: Importance and Success Ratings, 1977 Teachers: Community Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successf
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parental involvement in the education process	Pre-school	1	0	23	76	5	30	39	26
	Year 1	0	6	24	70	12	35	42	11
	Year 2	2	6	26	66	13	34	43	10
Links between the school and the home	Pre-school	0	1	15	84	4	22	49	25
	Year 1	0	0	21	79	1	30	53	16
	Year 2	0	2	21	77	4	24	51	21

Table A2.11: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Social and Emotional Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successf %
Emotional control and maturity	Pre-school	0	2	26	72	2	2	63	33
	Year 1	0	4	24	72	0	8	54	38
	Year 2	0	3	44	53	0	2	60	38
A positive self-image	Pre-school	0	4	19	77	0	11	46	43
	Year 1	0	4	16	80	1	11	62	26
	Year 2	0	2	31	67	0	12	64	24
A positive attitude to school and schooling	Pre-school	0	7	30	63	0	4	50	46
	Year 1	0	1	18	81	1	11	48	40
	Year 2	0	5	19	76	2	12	53	33
Personal responsibility	Pre-school	0	13	37	50	0	17	57	26
	Year 1	1	12	37	50	4	20	55	21
	Year 2	0	7	37	56	2	27	59	12
Social skills	Pre-school	0	2	19	79	0	13	62	25
	Year 1	0	0	23	77	1	12	61	26
	Year 2	0	0	23	77	0	7	70	23
A moral code	Pre-school	0	2	17	81	0	19	58	23
	Year 1	0	0	13	87	1	14	64	21
	Year 2	0	0	14	86	0	17	67	1[illegible]

Table A2.12: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals, General Cognitive Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successf
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Memory	Pre-school	2	26	47	25	0	21	62	17
	Year 1	1	8	43	48	0	16	57	27
	Year 2	0	7	35	58	0	12	67	21
Classification	Pre-school	7	15	38	40	2	2	80	16
	Year 1	1	6	33	60	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	9	47	41	*	*	*	*
Seriation	Pre-school	0	15	46	39	0	16	64	20
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	9	44	47	0	9	77	14
Spatial and temporal relations	Pre-school	0	20	39	41	2	13	74	11
	Year 1	0	4	32	64	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	5	32	63	*	*	*	*
Thinking	Pre-school	2	6	46	46	2	22	69	7
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	0	42	58	0	36	57	7
Perception	Pre-school	0	4	28	68	2	7	66	25
	Year 1	0	0	15	85	0	8	64	28
	Year 2	0	0	19	81	0	12	59	29

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.13: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Physical Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successf %
Fine muscle control	Pre-school	2	7	28	63	0	16	53	31
	Year 1	0	2	18	80	0	8	52	40
	Year 2	0	3	45	52	0	2	53	45
Gross muscle control	Pre-school	0	2	24	74	0	7	44	49
	Year 1	0	5	31	64	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	0	10	40	50	0	12	67	21
Ability to play games	Pre-school	6	17	44	33	0	15	58	27
	Year 1	*	*	*	*	1	14	55	30
	Year 2	0	12	42	46	2	7	64	27
Health skills	Pre-school	0	0	24	76	0	11	62	27
	Year 1	0	1	18	81	0	11	60	29
	Year 2	0	2	17	81	3	14	50	33
Physical fitness	Pre-school	2	15	46	37	0	13	67	20
	Year 1	4	11	50	35	0	10	68	22
	Year 2	5	7	50	38	0	10	66	24

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.14: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Language Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successfu %
Reading and pre-reading skills	Pre-school	4	20	39	37	2	10	60	28
	Year 1	0	1	4	95	0	8	51	41
	Year 2	0	2	7	91	2	10	51	37
Writing and pre-writing skills	Pre-school	4	35	33	28	0	13	67	20
	Year 1	0	1	10	89	0	7	61	32
	Year 2	0	0	7	93	2	7	61	30
Speaking skills	Pre-school	0	2	19	79	0	13	62	25
	Year 1	0	1	9	90	1	9	58	32
	Year 2	0	0	9	91	2	3	65	30
Listening skills	Pre-school	0	4	17	79	0	17	66	17
	Year 1	0	0	6	94	2	14	67	17
	Year 2	0	0	5	95	2	21	58	19
Spelling skills	Pre-school	80	11	2	7	34	11	34	21
	Year 1	26	36	20	18	8	21	51	20
	Year 2	0	12	35	53	0	7	72	21

Table A2.15: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Mathematics Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly successfu %
Number and number operations	Pre-school	71	13	14	2	23	15	41	21
	Year 1	1	5	20	74	1	7	68	24
	Year 2	0	0	14	86	0	12	58	30
Sets and logic	Pre-school	2	47	33	18	0	26	49	25
	Year 1	•	•	•	•	1	12	53	34
	Year 2	2	5	37	56	2	12	53	33
Measurement and estimation	Pre-school	22	37	28	13	5	34	44	17
	Year 1	4	18	32	46	0	25	58	17
	Year 2	0	9	47	44	0	19	63	18

• These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.16: Importance and success Ratings, Principals: Social Studies Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successful
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Knowledge of relationships of various groups and individuals within the community	Pre-school	6	24	37	33	0	21	59	20
	Year 1	0	4	41	55	1	10	62	27
	Year 2	0	0	35	65	2	7	68	23
Knowledges of patterns of interdependence in the community and in society	Pre-school	36	34	21	9	5	30	51	14
	Year 1	6	27	45	22	1	18	67	14
	Year 2	0	16	56	28	0	14	67	19
Knowledge of man's relation to his physical environment	Pre-school	46	32	13	9	12	30	42	16
	Year 1	20	37	25	18	6	23	55	16
	Year 2	9	28	35	27	5	14	71	10
Knowledge of various roles of individuals in the community	Pre-school	4	28	35	33	2	13	60	25
	Year 1	1	10	37	52	0	14	49	37
	Year 2	0	2	42	56	0	7	55	38
Knowledge of rules and cultural traditions within a society	Pre-school	18	41	28	13	2	30	51	17
	Year 1	8	20	41	31	3	22	57	18
	Year 2	2	7	58	33	2	15	76	7

Table A2.17: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Art Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important %	Slightly important %	Moderately important %	Highly important %	Not successful %	Slightly successful %	Moderately successful %	Highly succes %
Basic art skills	Pre-school	9	28	28	35	5	11	50	34
	Year 1	10	15	47	28	*	*	*	*
	Year 2	2	19	49	30	*	*	*	*
Appreciation and enjoyment of art	Pre-school	13	13	30	44	7	2	57	34
	Year 1	5	6	36	53	4	13	56	27
	Year 2	2	7	33	58	2	16	54	28
Artistic expression	Pre-school	11	11	37	41	5	14	39	42
	Year 1	4	15	39	42	1	25	43	31
	Year 2	5	12	43	40	0	25	55	20

* These aims were rated significantly differently at the .01 level by the 1977 EEC and PR teachers.

Table A2.18: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Music Aims

		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
AIM Development of		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successfu
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Basic concepts of music	Pre-school	4	24	44	28	0	20	53	27
	Year 1	0	13	51	36	1	16	54	29
	Year 2	0	5	51	44	2	21	51	26
Appreciation and enjoyment of music	Pre-school	2	9	33	56	0	5	53	42
	Year 1	2	4	41	53	4	6	51	39
	Year 2	0	9	35	56	5	12	47	37
Ability to play instruments	Pre-school	15	26	33	26	11	27	41	21
	Year 1	15	23	42	20	12	26	43	19
	Year 2	2	35	40	23	12	19	53	16
Singing	Pre-school	0	11	39	50	2	4	56	38
	Year 1	0	9	44	47	4	6	54	36
	Year 2	0	7	42	51	7	2	49	42
Movement and dance	Pre-school	2	7	37	54	0	27	49	24
	Year 1	0	9	42	49	1	20	56	23
	Year 2	0	7	41	52	2	19	53	26

Table A2.19: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Science Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly success
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Knowledge of living things	Pre-school	6	17	34	43	0	13	54	33
	Year 1	0	5	44	51	0	10	57	33
	Year 2	0	0	38	62	0	2	63	35
Knowledge of conservation	Pre-school	4	19	41	36	0	18	62	20
	Year 1	1	10	35	54	0	16	63	21
	Year 2	0	7	28	65	0	9	63	28
Knowledge of earth in space	Pre-school	26	46	22	6	7	34	52	7
	Year 1	15	33	41	11	4	30	54	12
	Year 2	9	28	42	21	2	32	54	12

Table A2.20: Importance and Success Ratings, Principals: Community Aims

AIM Development of		IMPORTANCE OF AIM				SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AIM			
		Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Highly important	Not successful	Slightly successful	Moderately successful	Highly successfu
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parental involvement in the education process	Pre-school	0	0	23	77	7	29	38	26
	Year 1	0	6	21	73	6	34	43	17
	Year 2	0	7	26	67	9	30	47	14
Links between the school and the home	Pre-school	0	0	13	87	2	25	48	25
	Year 1	0	1	12	87	4	21	52	23
	Year 2	0	0	9	91	7	16	49	28

REFERENCES

Bennett, N., *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*, Open Books, London, 1976.

Department of Education, Queensland, Information Statement No. 19: 'Educational Statistics', *Education Office Gazette*, vol. 79, no. 11, 1977, pp 1–16.

Helson, H., 'Current Trends and Issues in Adaptation – Level Theory', *American Psychologist*, 1964, vol. 19, pp 26–38.

Mayo, E., *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Viking Press, New York, 1960.

Walberg, J.H. & Thomas, S.C., *Characteristics of Open Education: Towards an Operational Definition*, Report to the U.S. Office of Education, No. OEC–1–7–062805–3936, 1971.